E-MAT Survey of FerrisConnect Faculty

In January and February, members of the E-Learning Management Advisory Team (E-MAT) conducted a series of forums to solicit university stakeholders' input as a basis for developing plans for the future of online learning at Ferris.

To continue gathering input a survey was launched on February 24, 2011 with email invitation sent to a list of faculty who had active FerrisConnect accounts on that date; a list of 473 individuals. A reminder email was sent to the same group on March 3 and the survey closed March 10.   A total of 177 responses were collected.

Student Capabilities, Rights, and Responsibilities

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral or No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A student orientation should be required before students can begin an online **course.**	85 (48.3%)	59 (33.5%)	15 (8.5%)	12 (6.8%)	5 (2.8%)
	144 (81.8%)			17 (9.6%)	
A student orientation should be required before a student begins an online **program.**	122 (69.3%)	35 (19.9%)	8 (4.5%)	4 (2.3%)	5 (2.8%)
	157 (89.2%)			9 (5.1%)	
If required, a student orientation for an online program should be incorporated into the first course in a program.	70 (39.8%)	45 (25.6%)	20 (11.4%)	17 (9.7%)	22 (12.5%)
	115 (65.4%)			39 (22.2%)	
Students should be able to demonstrate that they have the capability to be an effective online learner through a pre-assessment.	80 (45.5%)	54 (30.7%)	21 (11.9%)	15 (8.5%)	4 (2.3%)
	134 (76.2%)			19 (10.8%)	
If an orientation is required, students should enroll and pay for a course of at least 1/2 credit (7.5 hours of instructional time).	23 (13.1%)	22 (12.5%)	61 (34.7%)	38 (21.6%)	32 (18.2%)
	45 (38.1%)			70 (39.8%)	
Decisions about required student orientations should be standard across the University.	77 (43.8%)	61 (34.7%)	13 (7.4%)	14 (8.0%)	10 (5.7%)
	138 (78.5%)			24 (13.7%)	

Comments about student capabilities, rights, and responsibilities:

- Many students have the skills already to be successful. Only a few have problems - why make it a requirement for an orientation when only a few actually need it?
- I think there needs to be an orientation and a determination of skills needed for online learning prior to enrollment. If they can't demonstrate needed competencies then require a course available online AND at regional centers.
- My responses imply that a student should either demonstrate competence *or* be required to take an online orientation at some point.
- I teach online classes to juniors and seniors in business. I have NEVER had a problem with a student who does not understand how to succeed in my course. I am incensed that the powers that be would consider imposing such an orientation on my students who DO NOT NEED IT because some 50-year-old nurses who hardly know how to turn on a computer are having trouble taking online classes. To impose blanket requirements where they are not needed is absurd! As I have said in multiple forums, if you want to have a student orientation to online courses, MAKE IT A PART OF FRESHMAN ORIENTATION and then the students will be set for their time at Ferris. DO NOT get between me and my students at the time they are registering with this unnecessary impediment. This all things to all people approach is very simplistic and beneath Ferris State University.
- Student orientations should have some standardizations (for the University), but should also be individualized for each program.
- If a student can demonstrate use of the computer (including Word) they can test out.
- Students enrolled in an on-line Program should enroll & pay for an orientation course. Students who are just taking a class or two on-line, should enroll in an orientation course or pass a pre-assessment but not have to pay for it
- Many of my students are not prepared to be self disciplined or understand the need for communication with the instructor. I also have lots of technical difficulties, i.e. computer crashed, can't find test/assignments, don't know or just don't use calendar/announcements and do not check the course/email regularly to keep informed.

- I strongly believe that students taking an online course should have some kind of orientation to online processes prior to beginning that course. Having taught online courses in the past, a lot of time is spent trying to explain things such as how to save an attachment, how to enter a discussion thread, etc. The focus of an online course should be the content of that course, not general computer functions and explaining how to use the platform. Anyone who is taking a fully online program should be required to complete an online orientation, regardless of previous course experience.
- Students should be given an on-line orientation while taking FSUS100. They should not be required to take an additional course!
- It would be best to put the orientation stuff during their summer orientation time. Therefore, they will be ready to go once school starts.
- For students taking one course, I don't see a separate orientation as necessarily mandatory. With the increase of online course programming, it makes sense to incorporate this into FSUS100, or to have a FerrisConnect type course that works like a tutorial that a student could complete on their own. For an entire program, it should be the equivalent of FSUS100, but not additional credits beyond the same 1.0 orientation credit that all students pay for.
- Our students have grown up on the Net. They know more about online interface than we do. They adapt instantly to online courses and just don't need any added course baggage.
- the nature of the orientation may need to be determined by program faculty, depending on the type of coursework and skills needed to function successfully
- There are a great variety in our programs, courses, and students. In my own online courses, I have noted and have confirmed in e-mail exchanges with students that my students have little trouble navigating my course (good course design is a must), but life factors such as work, family, or other distractions are what interfere. Standard plagiarism and tardiness is more of a problem than the online environment.
- It's unclear what information you are seeking in the item - but I will mention that student capabilities are broad ranging from the 18 year old freshman with special needs / disabilities to the 50+ retired veteran with 30 years of military service seeking a teaching certification or second career.
- Students must have access to hi speed wireless. All students, not just distance learners, should be proficient in use of Ferris Connect, browsers, and basic navigation.
- The problem with orientations is that teachers set up their online classes in different ways. For instance, some instructors use the Learning Modules but others use folders on the main page. This can cause problems when students take an orientation saying something can be found in a certain spot and that isn't true for the course. I do think an orientation is important, and I provide students with my personalized orientation. I think it would be impossible to have an orientation that is standard across the University since different programs have different requirements. I do think skills like submitting assignments, understanding the various tabs under the assignment/assessment areas, how to post to discussion forums, etc, could be helpful.
- This is one of the most critical components for students to be successful online and subsequently decrease attrition in the first semester.
- Will be highly variable and therefore must be assessed.
- The course they take for their orientation should not cost $ and it should be before they take an online course, not integrated.
- There needs to be some way to measure a student's ability prior to their taking an on-line course or if we cannot measure that we should at least have some key readiness indicators so a student knows what they need to have accomplished to be successful OR they should be limited to junior or senior level courses or grad level.
- An effective orientation module would not require direct instructional time of a faculty member - and charging credits is not necessary.
- Some programs don't have a clear entry point course, so the question about incorporating orientation into the first course is a bit grey. I believe orientation should occur before the first online course, but once taken, don't require it for every course. Orientation should not be cost based. I am not comfortable with standard university orientations as they won't necessarily be a good fit with what they need in a particular program.
- I don't think FSU should charge students to learn whether they can effectively take an online course. I think that some kind of orientation should be required for everybody before starting a program; but for each course after that they should be able to somehow test out. There should be a core orientation that all FSU students take and then programs can add on program-specific info.
- If there is a paid-for orientation course, students should be able to test out of it.
- How will a student demonstrate she/he is capable of online learning? How will this be determined or measured?
- Paying for the orientation is like paying for the tour of the campus. Why not have faculty rotate or student assistants to give the presentation. Have the perspective students come to us!
- orientation before starting online program; orientation before taking online course
- Orientation should take place before any online program, and should be offered through the university.
- I know I have taken this survey once already, but was told it was a new one today. (3/3/11). Oh well. I believe a student should not have to take an orientation for online courses more than once. I think doing one before starting an online

program would be ideal. If that doesn't happen, students should take one before a course, but only once. I definitely believe required student orientations should be standard across the Univ.

- Students' capabilities as it relates being able to navigate throughout FerrisConnect seems to vary greatly typically based on their prior computer knowledge and usage, not necessarily because of our system specifically.
- From personal observation, students tend to wait until the last possible minute to do online work. The course needs to be designed so that students are required to turn in assignments more often. Also, online courses cannot be used in place of laboratory work in most science fields.
- I have created and taught a 100% On-line Orientation and have received feedback from students that it was well worth the time and effort to complete. I STRONGLY favor an On-line Orientation! Students need to know HOW to function and what expectations are placed upon them prior to starting an On-line series of classes.
- 1. Standardizing requirements across programs fails to recognize that cognitive processes involved in learning to weld and program machine tools are fundamentally different that cognitive processes involved in a creative writing assignment. 2. Standardization also assumes that there is someone or some committee who knows or can determine what is best for all students in all disciplines - which seems like a ridiculous assumption to me.
- 3. Students are already in the program and taking the class online. A little late. 5. Demonstrate necessary skill.
- Not clear about what you mean by a student orientation - in person? online??? therefore neutral on the subject. Different courses may need more guidance - especially if it is an online program (maybe needing a day or weekend of orientation to the program) Very difficult to demonstrate capability to be an online learner if you haven't done it. Also people change - this should not be required. If orientation is required it should be part of a class NOT separate. Having standards are good - but some courses are straightforward and I think students do not need an orientation. Especially if the online course is designed in a proper fashion.
- If an online course is required for a program, and therefore the student is required to take this course for graduation, the student should not be required to PAY for a general orientation course for any online course. If the orientation course is specific for a program and includes information beyond that needed to take an online course, I think it is fine to make the student pay for the course.
- Many students want online courses because they assume they do not have to put any effort into the courses. A required online pre-assessment would let them know if their computer and Internet connections and settings are adequate for the demands of online learning. It also provides them a sample of the hard work that is actually needed for successful online learning. Many colleges REQUIRE a student pre-assessment for each course and will not allow students to enroll in online courses unless they pass the pre-assessment. It should be noted that the pre-assessment is a determination of the students' willingness and ability to take an online course, not an assessment of the instructor.
- Dealing with students' technical problems (personal or hardware issues) should not take time away from the instructional mission of any individual course. By requiring a single preparatory course as a prerequisite to any online instruction, those who are unable or unwilling to demonstrate abilities for successful completion will be removed from the cohort before they end up in a bad position. Such a course should be uniform and contain ALL of the potential tools and technology required by ANY course in which they may enroll. Therefore, a thoughtful and all-encompassing effort to create an orientation course for all programs is essential.

Faculty Capabilities, Rights, and Responsibilities

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral or No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
To be assigned a fully online or blended course, a faculty member should be required to demonstrate that they have appropriate teaching skills.	80 (45.5%)	66 (37.5%)	15 (8.5%)	6 (3.4%)	9 (5.1%)
	146 (83%)			15 (8.5%)	
To be assigned a fully online or blended course, a faculty member should be required to complete a professional development workshop that includes online pedagogy and use of the technologies.	56 (31.8%)	69 (39.2%)	19 (10.8%)	22 (12.5%)	10 (5.7%)
	125 (71%)			32 (18.2%)	
Faculty who teach online courses should be required to have the pedagogical component of their courses reviewed by peers using a best practices' rubric for online delivery, such as those promoted by the Faculty Center or Quality Matters.	37 (21.0%)	49 (27.8%)	31 (17.6%)	33 (18.8%)	24 (13.6%)
	86 (48.8%)			57 (32.4%)	
Faculty who teach at least half of their load online should be required to have students assess at least one of their online courses.	81 (46.0%)	58 (33.0%)	18 (10.2%)	10 (5.7%)	8 (4.5%)
	139 (79%)			18 (10.2%)	
The University needs to employ an additional instructional designer to support faculty who teach blended and online courses.	71 (40.3%)	48 (27.3%)	40 (22.7%)	11 (6.3%)	6 (3.4%)
	119 (67.6%)			17 (9.7%)	
New faculty hires should be required to possess and/or develop online teaching skills.	24 (13.6%)	51 (29.0%)	34 (19.3%)	37 (21.0%)	28 (15.9%)
	75 (42.6%)			65 (36.9%)	
A group of faculty with higher teaching loads who would work from a distance should be created; with no expectations for scholarship or service.	10 (5.7%)	13 (7.4%)	44 (25.0%)	42 (23.9%)	63 (35.8%)
	23 (13.1%)			105 (59.7%)	
Faculty should be able to have their entire teaching load fulfilled with online courses.	42 (23.9%)	41 (23.3%)	38 (21.6%)	31 (17.6%)	24 (13.6%)
	83 (47.2%)			55 (31.2%)	

Comments about faculty capabilities, rights, and responsibilities:

- Faculty do not have their pedagogical techniques reviewed going into a classroom, why should that change for an online course?
- We need to keep in mind that the technology is simply a tool that can be used to differing degrees. Good teaching online isn't all that different from good teaching face to face. It's not about the technology per se. Anything required of online should also be required of face to face. We have little in place once a person is tenured to assure that quality face to face teaching is taking place.
- We do not need another instructional designer, just someone that will assist and provide models of best practices. All faculty should be required to have an online supplement for their courses.
- It really should not matter if hour teaching load is on campus or online. Online courses require the same amount of work and more.
- Different programs have different needs--it seems we need some flexibility in meeting the demands of the changing higher education arena.
- Teaching online well is just as important as teaching face to face classes. FSU needs to stop treating online as inherently different than effective face to face teaching. We used to have an online SAI, it worked well when I used incentives for students to complete it, what happened to this evaluation?
- Re: Professional development workshop: workshop for new online faculty or demonstrate competence Content review: unless face-to-face is reviewed for best practices why should online be reviewed for best practices? Faculty with higher loads: service, committee assignments-no; scholarship-yes
- My responses imply that faculty should either demonstrate competence *or* be required to take an online orientation and training. Faculty new hires who have taught elsewhere online, for example, shouldn't be required to go through a required

course.

- If faculty are advisors of on campus students, they should not be able to have a full online load thus never coming to campus.
- It smells like this group is trying to establish blanket rules for the whole university. Flexibility is key -- the implementation of online teaching should be left to the college and department to find the right solutions and fit. As for teaching 100% online -- this eventually will render faculty quite out of touch with students...I believe that some face-to-face teaching should be a requirement, although a semester or term that's 100% online (especially summer) should be no problem.
- Tenure & promotion issues need to be considered. If faculty teach only online, they would need a commitment that they have security for extended periods of time. If we move to this model, we need consistency in providing quality outcomes for our students from a dedicated cohort of online instructors.
- Online faculty should be required to complete more than just a workshop before teaching online.
- With regard to required professional development workshop, there should be a way for experienced faculty to provide alternative evidence or test-out of the workshop requirement.
- It is important for faculty to be on campus at least some of the time to develop relationships with peers & students. They need to be a part of the University community in order to work collaboratively across colleges and with administrators.
- Requiring a faculty member to have their course reviewed and approved steps on too many toes and sends a signal of distrust and a lack of confidence in the teacher assigned to the course. If an instructor has completed training for best practices and online course pedagogies and demonstrated that they have acquired the necessary skills, then there shouldn't be any further need to 'supervise' them. No one does that to us in our in-person classes, and you should expect a great deal of backlash if you try to do it for an online course.
- Far too often IT instructed courses are too focused on 'bells and whistle' system features that add little value to course instruction.
- Do not create a class system that administratively treats online teaching as different from face-to-face. Create support systems instead.
- Instructional design support can come from individuals other than a dedicated position; new hires don't need online facility until they are going to be teaching online; disagree that higher teaching loads should prevail for online-only faculty.
- First, I would hope for support and not more hoops; we should be concerned about how to create the best teaching environment for all medium and that meets peer support, available training, and models of effective teaching. But the end of this section disturbs me. Students will not be well served if we create a separate class of online teachers who are otherwise disconnected from the work of Ferris State University.
- I assume our faculty have already demonstrated that they have appropriate teaching skills during the hiring process, annual performance review processes and promotion and tenure application processes. REQUIRING yet another layer of job performance review is redundant, wasteful and is unlikely to be conducted by people any more qualified that the professional faculty members being reviewed. If online teaching is a relevant job skill, then revise existing performance appraisal processes to include it. Search committees, program faculty, chairs and deans should be left to decide whether online teaching skills (whatever this is supposed to mean) are prerequisite for new hires. Aren't these the very experts we have within the organization for these decisions? Who else here thinks they would be better at hiring qualified engineering, optometry or English professors? If this is a university then there should always be an expectation of scholarship or service even in teaching online courses. Otherwise, the online course can be any non-scholarly garbage, such as a course proposal I recently reviewed that was mostly things the instructor copied and pasted from Wikipedia. It seems fraudulent, if not an actual crime to charge people tuition fees for unscholarly nonsense. But again, don't we already have faculty curriculum review and development committees in place doing this work? Is there a valid reason to question their judgments? Standardizing anything across 120 or so academic disciplines seems to suggest a certain level of ignorance about the diversity and variability of these disciplines. I can't imagine that the best practice rubric for teaching public budget analysis is applicable to doing a triage assessment of injuries with a patient just brought into an emergency room. Yes, the university needs more computer technology staff with skills beyond just instructional designer. My office computer has been infected with virus for weeks that interferes with using internet browsers. After multiple visits from IT helpers, the problem remains. Good thing I don't have to depend on the university computer and instructional technology to teach my classes.
- I think the questions relate a little differently between full-time and adjunct faculty. For example, faculty should be able to have their entire teaching load fulfilled with online courses I assume mean full-time, as an adjunct might teach only 1 or 2 courses. In terms of demonstrating competence in on-line teaching, I think previous years of teaching on-line courses and/or certification from another college or university should be accepted.
- Only new faculty for whom their load REQUIRES that they will teach on line should be required to have those skills.
- On-line faculty need to be considered the new face next to the old face representing FSU and should also be given status like in-seat faculty.
- Ferris State University stands for certain things and that is created through a mixture of discussions and meetings with co-workers and other departments. Instructors working from a distance without any ties to the university community, and who are working with higher workloads, sounds like we would be offering courses that weren't Ferris but rather could be offered by anyone. Students choose Ferris for a reason, and we don't want to dilute that by offering generic classes with

distance faculty that have no personal or professional ties to the university.

- The online environment is going to impact the way we conceptualize the faculty role...this is not necessarily a bad thing.

- Decisions regarding online courses should be standardized from department to department. Scholarship of teaching could be critical from those engaged in online teaching to both enrich their peers as well as the academy.

- Not all faculty are needed to teach online and not all faculty will do well there, it should not be required. The problem with the distance faculty idea is that they have no connection the program or the university - they probably wouldn't know much about either-they would only know the individual courses. Students need more mentoring than that. Faculty that have their entire load as online classes should not be relieved of ever coming to campus.

- Do not create a two-party system of faculty expectations and residency!

- Part of being a faculty member is the face to face connection with students and face to face connection with the campus community. Pure on-line means that faculty members may not integrate themselves within the fabric of our campus community.

- Review should not be done by peers but by a decentralized online development office. Having faculty members who teach higher loads therefore having higher impacts on our students but do not incorporate service into their schedules is an unacceptable model to fit with Ferris' mission and values!

- These statements don't recognize teachers with existing skills or training obtained at other institutions/organizations. For example, I took a 5 week online training course through the University of Maryland to become an online professor. I took a 1 week training course through the University of Maryland to be certified in Wimba. I am very much against having online teachers exempt from service or scholarship. We have too many people that already feel that service or scholarship doesn't apply to them. I think graduate faculty in particular need an expectation of journal publication on an ongoing basis. Many of the online courses are a farce. They are nothing more than do an assignment and turn it in - with perhaps a few discussion threads thrown in. No real instruction.

- Who would be the online pedagogy police? Bad idea!!! A rubric implies that similar pedagogy is necessarily good in all disciplines. Bad idea!!! That sort of policing is not appropriate in face-to-face courses and should not be used in online courses either. Ferris' reputation and any good university's reputations depend on faculty who also are expected to keep up in scholarship and service. Creating a group w/o those responsibilities will water down the quality of Ferris' instruction. Really bad idea!!!

- Any faculty member already hired at Ferris should already have sufficient teaching skills to teach online. F2F skills have to come first.

- Some courses, e.g. technical and science courses with labs cannot be effectively taught online!!!. We learn best by doing. Labs are for hands on learning. In fact, courses with labs probably should not be permitted to be taught online. We have a science course with lab being taught online at present. Good students complain that they are getting A's but do not understand the course content. Anything that reduces quality of instruction should NOT be used. I have deep concerns about online for the first two years of college. One of the major functions of faculty is to be role models for our students. In an online course, the ability to be a role model is seriously limited.

- There are remarkable differences in online courses. While this is true of face to face classes as well, in the online environment it is important that the faculty understand the very different needs of students in this type of learning environment. The canned course approach and the lack of instructor or peer/peer interactions is very evident in some courses. Faculty who teach online should understand how to use modules, and should have knowledge of how to create a course that is organized and interactive. I see this as something that is lacking in many online course structures, in part because of the lack of knowledge, but also because faculty do not seem vested in wanting to grow in this area (as evidenced by the lack of participation in faculty development offerings).

- Online class assessed - with a proper tool! Higher teaching load with release - need more details as some would take advantage, but it isn't that they don't now!

- There should be no distinction between faculty who teach online and those who teach face to face in terms of union membership

- At the present time, I don't believe we should have faculty who are only online until the Univ comes up with standards of assessment and other f2f tools of collaboration and team-building not yet present. We also need a more robust/reliable teaching platform than FerrisConnect. I don't think we are ready yet for online only faculty.

- On the last three points, I would mark something much stronger than Strongly Disagree if I could. To me, all three of these are directly opposed to my sense of a University as a Community of Scholars.

- So I work on campus and am expected to do service, attend meetings, build community relationships, advise students, advise a club, AND there should be other faculty paid the same as me who teach on-line and won't be required to do this? Do you think that would be fair?

- . . . Faculty member should be required to demonstrate that they have appropriate teaching skills - isn't this part of the hiring process that faculty search committees do? Faculty.... should be required to have the pedagogical component of their courses reviewed by peers . . . - isn't this the role of the various curriculum committees now? It seems like some of the things you ask about are already in place and functioning - so I have to wonder if the e-mat people think that current hiring processes and /or curriculum review processes are not working OR if they think that on-line education is completely

different from face-to-face education so current processes are irrelevant OR if changing all these processes is a way to get less qualified people to work more cheaply on a course-by-course contract, thereby increasing business profits from a non-profit public service. No expectations for scholarship or service - really?!?! So Ferris will abandon its' status as a university to become Woody's on-line diploma factory.

- The University needs to employ an additional instructional designer to support faculty who teach blended and online courses. There needs to be support-but I don't know if it needs to be a designer.

- 1. This is an evaluation process. There is no standard evaluation process across campus. 3. We don't evaluate classroom delivery design. 3. Different opinions by different people 4. Evaluation is an administration process and to force return a faculty might have to bribe students. What instrument? 5. Is this person going to actually be there for faculty or doing all sort of other things.7. Holding faculty to different standards yet competing for the same promotions and merit NO NO NO. 8. Administration assigns load

- Faculty teaching on line should be held just as accountable as teaching face to face - For example sitting in on lecture could be replaced with access to the online teaching format, and discussions, etc... There should not be excess watch - no more than other courses. Online and blended courses can differ quite substantially - requiring an instructor who uses Ferris connect to post notes/online quizzes/grading etc.. To go through training for teaching practices online seems a bit over the top to me. The statement about faculty with higher teaching loads? Who would work from a distance? With no expectations for scholarship and service? Not clear. This does not sound like a faculty member to me. The standards for generating such a position are clearly not justified. A faculty member could have all online courses - but I still think that this should be a faculty member that has obligations to the university and its students. I have even heard a story about a student here at Ferris who could not contact the faculty member because they are not here! Seems like an AWFUL practice to start putting into place. If some of these suggestions get placed into action - the university will surely suffer - it is not in line with our mission!

- A group of faculty with higher teaching loads who would work from a distance should be created; with no expectations for scholarship or service. Across our Institution, we do have faculty who can be categorized this way?

- While I think it is important that ALL faculty (tenured, tenure-track, and adjunct) are consistently evaluated for teaching skills, I think it is wrong to require faculty that teach online courses to take a special set of developmental courses. It may be a good idea to make all new online courses required to be a developmental course for the first two offerings. In order to be upgraded to a permanent course, the course must receive positive evaluations from either SAI or (better yet) IDEA forms. I am ag...

- The on-line abilities of new faculty are curriculum and program specific--based on need. If a program decides that they require all new faculty to have this ability, so be it. But many (most) programs do not run on line and to require such is counter-productive. If not broken, don't fix it. In a perfect environment, program taught on campus or F2F in other locations would have a mandate of scholarship and service as has traditionally been done. In that perfect environment, on-line programming offers would differ in some way from those offered in the F2F world. In this way, we could develop two faculty groups - FF and online. Requirements, loads, tenure and promotion, and other policies would be developed to reflect each group's individual expectations. Similar to blending graduate faculty with undergraduate faculty, load and these other issues become difficult. If the university wants to move faster and faster to an online base, then a separate college for such activity needs to be maintained so that those instructors can be compared to online peers, and maintain a different level of involvement and expectations related to scholarship and service. A typical problem: Believing that participation in a committee by listening on a speakerphone somehow maintains the same level of involvement as those in the room. How can these people contribute to the accreditation preparation, program review, senate committees, and department issues without additional and inordinate efforts of the on-campus faculty to maintain that communication and lower their expectations of the online faculties' involvement? This does not even begin to address increased load placed upon the on-campus faculty for meeting the concentration of students and necessary advising. Same number of students on campus, less faculty to meet with them.

- A group of faculty with higher teaching loads who would work from a distance should be created; with no expectations for scholarship or service - I strongly disagree with this statement, as scholarship and service are a vital part of the academic community and relevant to disciplines.

- I think you have a flawed question set here. An earlier question might address academic freedom in the classroom and the appropriateness of assigning a method of instruction rather than a course. Programs should decide on courses, method of instruction and work out the details of how to best meet student and program needs. Assessment should be in line with other assessment requirements, not greater or less than for online instruction. I'm concerned with how his entire section is framed.

Course Quality and Learning Effectiveness

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral or No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Instructor responsiveness to students' questions and feedback on assignments is important in online learning.	127 (72.2%)	44 (25.0%)	2 (1.1%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.6%)
	171 (97.2%)			1 (0.6%)	
Instructor engagement in the online classroom through discussions, chat, and other methods is important to an effective online learning experience.	98 (55.7%)	51 (29.0%)	19 (10.8%)	6 (3.4%)	1 (0.6%)
	149 (84.7%)			7 (4.0%)	
Periodically, fully online courses should be reviewed by an instructional designer, and/or a peer reviewer, and/or a curriculum specialist to provide feedback to faculty members regarding opportunities for enhancement of delivery/learning effectiveness.	55 (31.3%)	68 (38.6%)	24 (13.6%)	18 (10.2%)	11 (6.3%)
	123 (69.9%)			29 (32.7%)	
Success on target learning outcomes for face-to-face and online learning should be compared.	66 (37.5%)	78 (44.3%)	22 (12.5%)	6 (3.4%)	2 (1.1%)
	144 (81.8%)			8 (4.5%)	
Good online course design incorporates a variety of teaching and learning strategies.	102 (58.0%)	59 (33.5%)	14 (8.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
	161 (91.5%)			0 (0.0%)	
The primary indicator of course quality is the extent to which learning is achieved.	71 (40.3%)	75 (42.6%)	20 (11.4%)	8 (4.5%)	2 (1.1%)
	146 (82.9%)			10 (5.6%)	

Comments about course quality and learning effectiveness:

- The environments are different. No one should evaluate an online course that has not had at least 40 courses fully online.
- While I strongly agree that quality of the course depends on learning on the part of the students, how does one measure that. I feel a follow up on the learning made by students in the successive classes is another indicator of the quality of previous courses taken by students.
- Success on target learning outcomes for f2f and online can be compared if the program requires the same assessments for all courses. Online courses are evaluated similarly to a face to face course; other faculty visit the site and review it. I do not think an instructional designer should take on that role.
- Re: Course review: program review should be done for online as well as face-to-face Course Quality: I agree with the concept however the attempt to assess outcomes requires very detailed expectations as well as accurate pre- and post-assessment as well as considering the intent of the learner therefore some type of student/customer satisfaction indicators would make for better and more accurate assessment.
- What are you going to do with the answers to these questions? They seem highly theoretical. One thing I will say is that I have no understanding as to why I, as a tenured, full professor, should allow more intrusiveness into my online teaching than I am expected to allow in my face-to-face teaching. I am highly competent at both.
- If periodic review of fully online courses is required, there must be faculty input into how the process is applied and conducted, and what options there may be for fulfilling this requirement in different ways.
- If the course outcomes are the same because it's the SAME COURSE, the student should be able to meet it through an online course OR an in person course. If the student cannot meet the learning objectives because it's online, then it's not an appropriate class to teach online.
- My experience with FSU's IT support is that its primary value-added is in resolving system problems. My take is that there is virtually no value-added in course design/instructional areas.
- A review should be at the behest of the instructor.
- The measure of online or face to face courses is how well students achieve the learning outcomes for the course. I will say that my one experience of having my course reviewed was that I received really bad and even useless suggestions based on a fairly complete mis-understanding of the course and the subject matter. We don't routinely review face to face classes do we?
- I am unconvinced by the empirical research that clearly defined and validly measured target learning outcomes have been identified for everything (or anything) one learns in university courses. Therefore, it seems that some (much?) of the effort, time, money and resources spent on invalid, unreliable measures of 'outcomes' that few really agree about, is a wasteful pursuit of a culturally popular fad, a significant contributor to educational budget shortfalls, and contributes little

substantive understanding to the processes of learning, cognitive development and social/emotional maturation.

- Given Blackboard's serious limitations, what is the point of reviewed by an instructional designer? We are pretty limited in what we can design and use. After all, Firefox doesn't even allow the html converter to open, and explorer will not open lotus notes.
- It is difficult to measure quality in any delivery of education because each student has individual expectations. Measuring to the mean can erase the value each person finds in the course experience.
- Instructor engagement is very important in any class, but I don't feel the examples given (through discussions and chats) are the only ways to do it. I don't feel instructors have to be limited to just the course management system as a way for online communication with their students. I call students, and I encourage them to call me. I've also created course-related Facebook pages, blogs and videos. My other neutral answer wasn't neutral either -- I agreed about some things and disagreed with others. For instance, I think it can be very helpful to have someone review a course and offer feedback, but I don't think it should be required. I think it should be optional and something faculty members can request. We don't review face-to-face instructors in this manner, and I don't think we should online instructors either.
- These should be reviewed the same as traditional courses.
- I don't think I understand the phrase target learning outcomes. If you mean should outcomes for face-to-face and online courses that are the same courses be the same - absolutely. The last question is true for all courses not just for online courses. We teach so students will learn - not just to teach.
- Depends on how you are measuring learning! Do the students give the right answers to some contrived assessment tool?
- Part of the analysis on course quality needs to be of the students' learning style. Students who learn best in community or who are 'kinetic' learners may not participate to the same extent in online courses. In my experience, my engagement with the students through online discussions, classroom chat, or student group work has worked well to achieve the course objectives unless I have a learner who does not feel engaged with the cohort. It is occasionally a challenge to get the students to see online education as a form of distance education and not distance IN education, and to see that the online coursework can offer a sense of community that they would normally feel is only available in face to face settings. That being said, students who would enjoy the convenience and learning style of an online course are self selecting the courses - so if you are going to evaluate 'success on target learning outcomes for face-to-face and online learning' my suggestion is that there be an analysis of learning styles (such as the Kolb Inventory) so that the analysis is truly comparative.
- It is an entirely new environment requiring new skills and new ways of doing things - including oversight of how.
- There is not a single primary indicator of course quality. Learning is key, but so is stimulating interest in the subject, retention, engagement....
- Outcomes should be similar for face-to-face and online sections of the same course. Good online design incorporates a variety of strategies, but those strategies will be very different, depending on the subject matter. There must be no demand that a specific strategy be present in every course; that strategy may be totally inappropriate in some courses and in the pedagogical plan of some professors. The professor needs to be in charge, not some curriculum specialist who doesn't know anything about the specific field. Some sort of curriculum police troop is a really bad idea!!!
- I think courses differ and some don't require instructor presence as much as others.
- Departments should be in charge of deciding what's good online teaching, not the FCTL or a curriculum specialist.
- In addition to knowledge learned, there are many other factors, e.g. skills, values, motivation, determination, the ability to think and reason and solve problems. We must be sure that these are also being passed on to our students. These are caught more than they are taught.
- There is not always a correlation between these.
- Review - careful with this one as I see the complaints coming
- If courses go fully online, especially in these first few years of moving to a more fully-developed online presence for FSU, quality control is essential.
- All of these are important for face-to-face courses as well. Why should on-line be any different?
- There is an oxymoron here: effective online learning experience. There is NO substitute for face to face learning!
- Fully On-line courses should have the same learning outcomes as face-to-face courses, the challenge is to engage students such that they participate in the elements of classroom learning. That being said you will never get 100% participation for students and continual creativity to encourage students to participate is the key.
- 2. Based on the nature of the course3. I'm not sure instructional designers understand exactly what an instructor is doing a peer of choice would.
- Online course help should be available and encouraged but not required.
- While some of these questions states, Instructor engagement in the online classroom through discussions, chat, and other methods ... it should be noted that such tools are dependent upon the type of course materials. Discussions and chat may be great for some classes while others are involved perhaps with fundamental analysis using calculated questions or repeated assessments for mastery of subject.
- Assessment should be equivalent between F2F and online classes

Technology Support

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral or No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The current FerrisConnect platform meets most (85%) of my instructional delivery and learning assessment needs.	37 (21.0%)	78 (44.3%)	27 (15.3%)	25 (14.2%)	8 (4.5%)
	115 (65.3%)			33 (18.7%)	
There is a need to replace FerrisConnect platform due to deficiencies in instructional delivery and learning assessment.	26 (14.8%)	28 (15.9%)	74 (42.0%)	35 (19.9%)	10 (5.7%)
	54 (30.7%)			45 (25.6%)	
Daily support (M-F 8a-5p) from the two e-learning system administrators is sufficient for the current online environments.	6 (3.4%)	29 (16.5%)	71 (40.3%)	47 (26.7%)	21 (11.9%)
	35 (19.9%)			68 (38.6%)	
There is a need to expand the e-learning system administrators support and hours.	32 (18.2%)	49 (27.8%)	79 (44.9%)	13 (7.4%)	3 (1.7%)
	81 (46.0%)			16 (9.1%)	
Daily support (M-Th 7a-10p, Fr 7a-6p Sat 9a-3p, Sun 3p-9p) services from TAC is sufficient to provide adequate support for current online environments.	7 (4.0%)	50 (28.4%)	60 (34.1%)	43 (24.4%)	14 (8.0%)
	57 (32.4%)			57 (32.4%)	
There is a need to expand the TAC hours with student staffing to support our current online environments.	27 (15.3%)	41 (23.3%)	91 (51.7%)	14 (8.0%)	3 (1.7%)
	68 (38.6%)			17 (9.7%)	

Comments about technology support:

- The issue with TAC does not seem to be the hours available, but the number of people available. The primary issue with FerrisConnect is that it is cumbersome to use for faculty and students.
- I have found that directing students in my fully online classes to the TAC has been very helpful. They have provided excellent support. On the other hand, I rarely have immediate feedback from the FCTL. Bea returns calls and follows through. Megan never returns calls or emails. She has yet to resolve a single issue for me.
- I have a hard time getting a call back. Most of the time they are at meetings or not in today (e-learning) TAC is there all the time and ready to respond.
- Need to have support that can communicate with students who may not understand the techno buzz words.
- TAC does a good job of responding to requests for assistance in a reasonable amount of time. FerrisConnect has been very reliable--I would not change it or move to something free like moodle.
- FerrisConnect is inadequate to support the modern web based environment. We need to be looking at methods that will allow for delivery and completion of content using smart-phones, tablets and other hand held devices. Transitioning to a new platform will require coverage beyond 8-5pm!
- Meegan is amazing!
- TAC does not seem to be the first choice when having computer/technical difficulties with my online course.
- Many students seem to do a lot of their coursework online after 10 pm or on Sundays. Student support until midnight would probably be appropriate Sunday - Thursday. The current platform goes in streaks between being effective and not so effective. I'm not sure if any other system would be better than the current system, as all probably have their quirks. FSU would probably benefit greatly from having staff that dealt with the logistics of getting the courses designed. Other universities, particularly those with high enrollment in fully online programs, may have their own e-learning system administrator or larger instructional design teams than what we have on campus. While our system administrators and team are very helpful, there is only so much of them to spread across the campus and satellite sites.
- TAC support is very limited with the current FerrisConnect system.
- I wouldn't say that TACs hours need to be expanded - I'd say their TRAINING needs to be expanded if you expect them to be the problem solvers. I have never yet had a problem with FerrisConnect that they could solve. Most issues are within the platform and I always end up re-directed to the administrators anyway. Many students who are online work during the day and do their classes at night - so yes, there needs to be someone available to solve their problems when they're having them. (Don't know the best way to do that, but I taught my only fully online class using a platform created by the textbook at bypassed FC for the most part. Wiley has 24 hour customer and tech support, and I know that it was utilized by students after the 8-5 hours.)
- The technical support has been adequate so far, faculty may need to be flexible with students experiencing tech issues that

can't be resolved outside hours of tech operation.

- FerrisConnect is an extremely volatile platform that is too sensitive to browsers and requires a dated Java Script. I spend half of my life answering TAC support related questions about how to solve glitches in FerrisConnect. That said, and uploading files is the biggest headache sometimes, I make it work for me. What I can't do in FerrisConnect I accomplish though other platforms wither Google Doc or Wiki Spaces. I wish it wouldn't through us all back to who knows where when we try to open a pdf or Word document, but I can adapt.
- I don't know if hours been to be expand but abilities to solve computer problems seems to have room for improvement. And it would be wonderful, if technology support could actually ask faculty what software we need or use on instructional computers rather than installing software and setting up computers that is best for them. And why must I be locked out of the classroom computer cabinets? On more than one occasion, a class has been delayed or changed at the last minute because a computer component got pushed too far into a locked cabinet and I cannot pull it far enough forward to insert a DVD or video, or the IT staff arrive to see that a cord connection from one of the components. This seems like another inefficient use of staff time and resources.
- We need skilled TAC support, not students.
- Student learning takes place 7 and 24.
- About my neutral comments, we need to look at when students tend to use our online course management system and when problems tend to arise. Those are the times staffing needs to be available. We should have the data that can be analyzed. I like the announcements on the sign-in page that lets everyone know about upcoming scheduled outages. I've found that very helpful. The current FerrisConnect system has a number of deficiencies. One serious problem is if I mistakenly update the wrong feedback to a student, I cannot delete the incorrect file. This has happened before when I have more than one student with the same last name. While I can add the correct feedback, I cannot delete the incorrect feedback, which is a problem. It should be easier to download assignments to grade offline. I'd like to see all submissions for a single assignment download into one zipped folder rather than each student's submission inside a folder that is inside a folder. The tabs (inbox, submitted, graded, published) confuse students. They have a hard time finding their feedback. Dream request: If I upload feedback for an assignment that document should be available under the gradebook view as well. Right now, students see my comment to review the attached file, but they don't know where to look when checking grades under the my grades area. What I do like about FerrisConnect is that I can easily see what the course looks like as a student. This is very important. It helps me improve my course as well as assist students who are having problems finding things.
- TAC question is moot as many programs are requiring laptops and TAC will go away.
- Students seem to access their online courses at times that fall out of the normal business day - even after midnight.
- There is a need for additional hours for TAC but not sure that additional hours from students is helpful. Many times students in TAC are only able to log the problem not solve the problem.
- I have taught with other systems (C Tools from University of Michigan and Angel from Michigan State). I find the capabilities of Ferris Connect to be superior to those two systems for ease of use and capabilities. The tutorial program was excellent, and met my needs fully when I started teaching for Ferris. In regards to the hours of online support: has an analysis been done of typical user hours for the online courses? I teach in the School of Nursing. Several of the students in my courses work night shift, and are sometimes online in the 'wee hours', as am I due to needing to juggle this adjunct teaching position with a full time practice.
- It's a 24/7 world which requires 24/7 support. If you are going to have virtual classes you cannot assume that people are going to be taking them in a typical 8-5 manner.
- I have not found TAC to be that effective. The support hours listed - particularly with the system admins - do not match the peak utilization times of the system. Additionally, the maintenance windows often coincide with high utilization times. Maintenance should be more like 4 or 5am. Ferris Connect should be augmented, but not necessarily replaced.
- There is a need to let professors know in a timely manner if the platform is to be replaced. Professors are presently starting to create their online courses for the fall and most of that material will not port over satisfactorily. Administrators and/or IT people may think it's OK to make decisions in June or August for the fall, but that is not acceptable for the professors.
- Online enrollment is our fasted growing area. We better be prepared for future growth by having e-learning and TAC support as well at qualified teachers.
- I haven't had any problems getting TAC or e-learning support, but if we increase online offerings, we have to increase staffing to support it.
- Change always sounds nice, but will a new system be any better???
- I rarely need to use TAC services for FerrisConnect issues, but I hear of faculty who do so I am assuming there is a need. Primarily the TAC support for students needs to be in place for those times outside of the general 8-5 when most adult learners are working.
- The issues with FerrisConnect are not be specific to online learning, rather to poorly-designed and built software that introduces as many problems as it solves.
- TAC _ how can we respond when you are not providing us with demand curves or anything else? Would you want them to review the material you use in class?

- If the Univ is serious about online class work, there needs to be serious investment into our IT.
- If you are going to have on-line classes that meet in the evening then someone should be on call to answer questions if the service is down.
- Fully On-line student bases create an almost 24/7 environment. I have had students in the same class spanning over 10 time zones! We need to expand our thinking if fully online delivery is to grow!
- Daily support (M-F 8a-5p)- I teach some evening classes and had encounter an occasional instructional technology problem that forces me to switch to Plan B of being able to teach the same material with no technology. Student staff are nice kids but on occasion they don't understand my scholarly work well enough to help with the computer tools I need. For example, if I have a questions about a default assumption in how a statistical package analyzes data, no one here knows anything about the package because 'they don't use it'.
- 2. FC works for me. It allows me to give test, analyze the test stats, hand back homework and allows the student to resubmit.
- I think that the staffing seems adequate - but since I do not teach fully online I am not sure if there is something that fully online instructors would need. Students may log in more in the evenings for online instruction - but I am not sure that we would need to have technical support at all hours - In the classroom - there are times when technology does not work and the instructor must adapt - same thing should apply to a fully online course.
- There is a need to expand TAC hours but with adult employees (not unreliable students).
- The issue of ePortfolio needs to be addressed. Bb/Webct component is expensive but what university wide/university supported alternative is there? We are missing the boat on this

Plans - How Large, Who Decides, Who Enrolls

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral or No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
In order to foster growth, the University should reallocate resources (people and budgets) from existing delivery modes to online.	13 (7.4%)	41 (23.3%)	59 (33.5%)	46 (26.1%)	16 (9.1%)
	54 (30.7%)			62 (32.2%)	
Ferris should continue to develop fully online programs to enable the University to serve students from a wider geographic region as well as those who are place-bound.	44 (25.0%)	73 (41.5%)	34 (19.3%)	22 (12.5%)	2 (1.1%)
	117 (66.5%)			24 (13.6%)	
Ferris should continue the practice of restricting early enrollments in online courses to students who are admitted through locations other than Big Rapids or to a fully online program.	25 (14.2%)	67 (38.1%)	41 (23.3%)	30 (17.0%)	13 (7.4%)
	92 (52.3%)			43 (24.4%)	
Registration for Ferris courses should proceed according to the established priorities, without any reserved seats for those enrolling from locations other than Big Rapids or fully online programs.	14 (8.0%)	41 (23.3%)	55 (31.3%)	46 (26.1%)	19 (10.8%)
	55 (31.1%)			65 (36.9%)	
Residential (on-campus) students should be denied the ability to enroll in an online course.	11 (6.3%)	11 (6.3%)	23 (13.1%)	82 (46.6%)	48 (27.3%)
	22 (12.6%)			130 (73.9%)	
Ferris should provide as many sections of courses as student demand warrants, especially in general education offerings.	46 (26.1%)	67 (38.1%)	30 (17.0%)	15 (8.5%)	15 (8.5%)
	113 (64.2%)			30 (17.0%)	

If you were to suggest a maximum total that online learning should represent in the total university's enrollment, which of the following represents your view of what the maximum percentage should be:

10 (5.7%)   Less than 10%
83 (47.2%)   10 - 25%
52 (29.5%)   25- 50%
19 (10.8%)   More than 50%

Comments about how online offerings fit or should fit into the Ferris mission and model:
- Does the last question (shaded) intended to be about on-line courses? Or courses in general?
- Is demand higher for online than existing delivery methods? Is this drive for more online courses in the best interest of students or the best interest of our bottom line?
- Student demand is not a learner-centered approach to determining what courses are offered online and when. My experience has been that on campus students who take a mix of face to face and online, perform badly in the online if they even remember that they are in the course. There is little logic in allowing students on campus to enroll in fully online when we are at the same time trying to improve student engagement and online delivery is more expensive to offer. What students think they want is not always what is best for them.
- In regard to the above questions on growth and teaching on-line, I believe it should not grow unless it is tied to assuring faculty are proficient in teaching on-line.
- only if students are off/away from campus
- Seems like growth should be determined more by programs and colleges than by university wide policy.
- I think online is here to stay, fully online programs when done well (like the MBA) are attractive to students. I do not want to become university of phoenix though. Fully online programs should be for graduate work.
- Ferris should provide as many sections of courses as student demand warrants. End of sentence and comment. If students who live on campus want to take online offerings, let them! Let the market decide the number of online offerings.
- I disagree with the view that Ferris should move more vigorously into a fully-online model. We have programs and courses that naturally move to online delivery, but forcing programs, instructors, and courses online without a solid technology infrastructure, trained faculty, dedicated technical support, online course templates for quality, and a long-term online plan will be detrimental to the University's mission. Online is a natural response to our off-campus students' needs. Let's focus

on making that portion of Ferris' offerings the best they can be, rather than rushing to move as much as we can to fully online when we aren't ready to do so. (My percentage above refers to fully online classes, not to a total of fully-online and mixed delivery classes.)

- When we offer courses that Big Rapids campus students need only in the online format (and most of summer is online) we should restrict to off campus. Also as we are becoming a mobile society, mostly due to job changes, we need to allow students to finish their degrees if they have to relocate. Online gives them that opportunity. I think first semester FTIAC's shouldn't be in online until they can prove they can be successful in college (understand what they need to do).

- Again, you are looking for cookie-cutter solution. To deny Big Rapids students the right to EVER take an online course is ludicrous. One of the excellent uses of online instruction is to help students take courses that conflict with their required courses, or to take courses while out on internship, home for the summer, or to finish up the last few courses after walking. These always and never solutions are beneath you!

- Meeting demand for courses is contingent upon the availability of qualified faculty. Too often, adjuncts are placed with no prior knowledge of a course and/or no knowledge of FerrisConnect.

- Online instruction can be part of both main campus and other campus education; however, we would need to develop the culture and resources to make online more valuable in a face-to-face traditional setting: quiet computer lab work spaces, optional face to face meetings with online classes as needed, pair face-to-face sections with online sections in a format similar to what was used 20 years ago with televisions and fax machines, tech support labs on campus for online students, etc. In short we need to rethink the traditional campus and the services we offer!

- Provide as many courses as warranted and with evidence of successful learning outcomes being met in the online environment.

- Due to the hands-on technical nature of many of our programs it is difficult to offer a large majority of the classes on-line and have the students get the same experience as a FTF class.

- I don't know what I would suggest re: max. total. I don't think residential students should be denied enrollment for online courses but maybe a restriction of 25-50% of their credits may be online courses.

- I don't think all programs work in a fully online capacity, although they may benefit from an occasional online form of delivery. In terms of reallocation of resources, this should be on a case by case basis. Additionally, not all students are suited to being online learners, so changing all (or the majority) of courses to an online delivery format doesn't necessarily benefit all students. I do think that students who are in fully online programs and are based off campus should receive priority for registering for online courses, particularly Gen Ed courses.

- There has been an increase of off campus offering at the extension centers and many of these students need courses that fit their busy schedules. The University has not keep up with the pace in the offerings for online or blended courses for the off campus students. Many of the students would like to have choices when it comes to taking courses and the methods of delivery for the courses.

- I don't have a problem with online courses usually being reserved for off campus students. If they're here, they should be here in person. I will always believe that's best. However, I do have a MAJOR problem with how every online class is automatically 'hijacked' by CPTS. Our unit puts one class required for our majors online every summer, because that's how it works best for everyone. It's offered specifically for our majors, and yet they are locked out of it because they aren't part of CPTS. I had to place calls and argue on their behalf and deal with rude secretaries who cut me off just to get my upper level student enrolled in the online class I put on the schedule just for him. It's my class, it's my department, I don't like the fact that CPTS automatically owns it just because I offer it online.

- First, I don't think that having in mind a maximum total that online learning should represent in the total enrollment of the University is a good way to think about online learning. What factors ought to enter in to such a decision? Why choose an arbitrary maximum at all? Doing so suggests that the number of online sections should be driven by the revenue stream Ferris receives rather than pedagogy. I don't think the lure of potential revenue should be the driver of these decisions no matter how tantalizing they may be. Revenue as the driver of these decisions may also have the tendency to generate other bad decisions if the focus of the university is on revenue first rather than creating a good environment for student learning and success. Some courses should NEVER be offered online for a variety of reasons. Also, allowing student demand to drive the number of sections of courses (the question doesn't indicate online or face-to-face sections) is problematic from a faculty scheduling and resource allocation standpoint. What if, for example, student demand (and I'm not sure how this would be accurately determined either) indicated a need for 50 sections of ENGL 321 one semester and one the next instead of using historical enrollment pattern information to make these decisions? Student demand is sometimes driven by counseling (inadequate or adequate)and may also become a poorly understood function of the new MyDegree system. Also, right now, many students register for online sections of courses thinking the courses are easier or self-paced. When they discover that this is not the case, they drop out (especially younger students). Also, some students are unprepared for the discipline online courses demand of them (especially younger, traditional students). They make their decisions to take online sections for reasons that are not a match for the rigor of many of these courses. Then, when they discover that they have to work hard (or harder), they either drop out or criticize the course and/or the instructor. The University has a lot of groundwork to do with students before demand should be allowed to drive scheduling. Finally, regarding University oversight of online courses, I would like both courses offered face-to-face and online to receive the same degree of scrutiny.

Online courses should not be singled out for more scrutiny or critical review than face-to-face courses. In fact, I wish the University currently displayed as much interest in the quality of face-to-face courses as it has recently in the quality of online courses. Moreover, allowing faculty who elect to teach only online courses to opt out of the responsibilities they agreed to when they became tenured (or tenure-line) faculty is wrong no matter how many students they agree to admit to their courses or how many courses or sections they teach. Sometimes people agree to such conditions to meet their personal needs without considering pedagogical good sense or good outcomes for students. For example, there are some faculty teaching their loads fully online who are simultaneously teaching full time loads (or nearly so) for other institutions (and with the knowledge of the University). To sanction such practices is to reward bad behavior. I wonder if these faculty would be able to work in this way if they were required to live up to their other responsibilities. Faculty who teach online should be held to the same standards and rules as those who do not. It would be especially egregious to use the willingness of such faculty to take on additional students above course caps and to teach overloads in the statistical measures that drive online education at Ferris. I am also similarly concerned about having adjunct faculty teach fully online schedules as they are subject to the pressures of personal needs as well as economic pressures and may sacrifice course quality to these pressures (as I am sure the University is aware). Having said all of the above, however, I am a believer in the effectiveness of quality online education. All of my courses are at least web-enhanced, and I have taught a number of fully online and mixed delivery courses. I work diligently to improve the quality of both the online courses I teach and the ones I teach face-to-face. I often seek the help and critical review of fellow faculty in my department to do so. And, I constantly work to improve my teaching skills and learn to use new tools effectively. I regard it to be part of my responsibility as a tenured member of the faculty.

- I believe that FSU's policy actions in this area should be guided by market demand.
- I don't want to see online learning restricted.
- The number of sections should not exceed the number of trained faculty available to teach those sections, regardless of demand.
- The percentage is a bit of a read hearing. The key is that we should have a plan that specifically targets the programs and courses that we need to either expand to online or create more online sections. This should be based on conscious marketing and demand decisions and result in the allocation of appropriate resources to these ends.
- Which online offerings - some or all? Now or in the future? Any or all of the Ferris mission? What model? What information is this item seeking to uncover?
- Distance learning is the wave of the future and FSU needs to get on board with more offerings and with off campus program sites such as at the UC in Gaylord. Students from the local Gaylord area drive to TC to take blended classes.
- Ferris should continue its Mission philosophy of hands on learning of a profession or trade in order to enter the workforce as soon after graduation as possible.
- 1. Only take from existing delivery modes if the sch's have dropped to allow that shift of resources. 2. Since on-line students have priority registration privileges, it should be unnecessary to restrict early enrollment of on campus students. 3. Residential students are students too and are still the preponderant number of headcount and sch's. Should not be penalized.
- The traditional student of 1960s is no longer with us. With many students needing up to 7 years to complete their education making it user friendly to continue in course work to reach completion is crucial for student success. We need to consider that many students are also willing to enroll in FSU even if they are not living in Michigan. We are in a global environment today.
- Not every class works well online, so I don't think student demand should always dictate offering a course online or how many sections are online. I think priority for registering online classes should go to those off campus, but on-campus students shouldn't be denied completely either. At the same time, on-campus students might do better in online classes because they have high speed internet, which isn't always available in some of the rural areas.
- Ferris does not have the people, resources, or desire to develop fully online programs. Too many people say we can't and not enough say we can.
- For many programs, offering an online format is the most effective way to grow enrollment. Why wouldn't we want to do that?
- I don't understand how the third question is different than the second. To me they are both about restricting early registration to those at off-campus sites - yes we should do that. I am not sure a percentage for total number of online classes is a fair question - we need to only go online with courses that can be successfully taught online.
- Question on 'sections' does not specify f-2-f or online. There's no point in offering more sections if there aren't qualified instructors to staff them.
- Unless we teach students how to be online learners are we really teaching our students how to be students. What are the learning outcomes? What are the standards? To what standards are all faculty being held - a question that should be fairly asked even in the f2f classrooms.
- You need to include prefer not to respond in your questions.
- In regard to the question about number of sections, there is a need to balance number of sections between semesters for the general education offerings that are required of everyone. Students should be able to get the Comm 121 or Engl 150

course within their freshman year, but not all need to be able to get them fall semester.

- Some of the question answers could be 'that depends'. For example, we have responsibility to provide gen ed offering as required for student in programs that require those courses. In particular math, physics, chemistry, and other sciences. Also, under current gen ed guidelines we need to insure sufficient courses to enable students to meet requirements.
- In the previous question when you said maximum total that online learning should represent in the total university's enrollment it is not clear if you mean SCH or % of students that take any online class.
- Not everything *can* be taught online. That being said, what can be, should be. You'll attract more students that way.
- Online course offerings should also be increased to help disabled students and non-traditional students, as much as geographically distant students.
- FSU has for many years been known for quality instruction. We should not be chasing after a new source of making money by reaching additional people who would not come to our campus. In my opinion, Ferris should continue to emphasize QUALITY of instruction and QUALITY of our graduates who are prepared to enter the labor force when they graduate. Online courses will tend to reduce our quality of instruction and the quality of our graduates. Trying to be everything to everybody is not a wise choice. Let us concentrate on what we do best. Yes, some courses maybe be taught effectively online; but other courses cannot be taught effectively online. We need to decided which courses can be effective and which cannot be of maximum effectiveness when taught online and limit the online teaching to those courses which can be effectively taught online. I challenge anyone to show with clear evidence that COMM-105 can be taught effectively online. This is an oxymoron!!! I challenge anyone to show lab courses in technology, physics, chemistry, biology, etc. can be taught well online.
- Not all courses are ideal for the on-line environment.
- Online learning is a very accepted modality that has become as important as the face2face learning option.
- These are tough questions, let me ask you some: budget for existing ones, how is it working now?; restricting early enrollments now, why? What purpose does it serve? I thought on-campus students were the last to get into the online? On-campus students should be allowed in cases where there are schedule conflicts; Provide as many sections as needed - how is this defined? Does this include on-campus? Did we train them? How can we determine the percentage? Has anyone found any national statistics and a breakout of them?
- It provides greater 'opportunity'.
- There should be no set maximum. Evidence of learning and student satisfaction should determine maximums.
- Online offerings should be used in the same way as f2f or blended - to deliver the course content in the very best way to meet learning outcomes and student needs. There needs to be a variety of course delivery options for the large variety of students FSU is serving - and finances need to be provided to make it happen. I voted for 10-25% of courses because I believe allocating more resources than that to online would be detrimental to the Univ. mission.
- I believe residential students should be limited to the number of on-line classes they are able to register for. If students have to wait a semester to take English, math or other general courses and the demand for another class is there then Ferris will begin to lose the students because they will become frustrated and go elsewhere.
- I think the future will be mix of on-campus classes, off-campus classes and on-line delivery.
- I still believe the student learns more from a face-to-face class then one online. The student retains more and there is more interaction with the student in a face-to-face class.
- There is no way one person can intelligently answer the above question on what is the Maximum percentage
- To the extent that online coursework meets the expected outcomes we expect in our university, college, and program mission statements, it should not be limited in any way. The difficulty lies in determining which outcomes to value, and how to measure them. Rather than REACT to the marketplace, why didn't Ferris proactively define itself and its online programs, and then market THAT standard? It isn't just about tuition revenue and minimizing expenses, at least, not for those who are wise and responsible leaders.
- Ferris mission and model? But public service (education) is NOT a business & there really is no good reason why a 'shareholder' should make a profit off of someone else's education or educational debt. My impression, backed by some data on job placement and indebtness of students, is that much on-line education is based on a for-profit business model and has little to do with discovering new knowledge, skill development and personal growth. In many for-profit online programs, students graduate without some essential skills in their discipline, accreditation or ability to meet basic requirements to get jobs in their fields. It's a myth that online learning can take the place of face-to-face learning, so don't be seduced by the latest fad in pop culture. Think of this - revolutions changing North African and Middle East countries started online (an important tool) but power and persistence to take down governments and change the world is coming from people in the streets, engaged in the face-to-face debate and exchange of ideas.
- We need to conduct online teaching well. A set % doesn't make sense to me-let's take what the market will dictate. If we are going to do it, let's do it right.
- Students on main campus should be able to enroll in online courses - We are not going to see our students that live here - start to take all online courses - most students actually come to school to go to school. I think that if student demands warrant more class sizes shouldn't we be offering more sections (within reason) - I thought that this is what we already did.
- The above percentage is a poorly thought out question. There needs to be a time frame element...It is not clear.

- The university should only expand their online offerings if they have faculty who are - instructionally and technically - qualified to actively teach online courses. For example, at a minimum the online instructor should be present in the virtual classroom through active participation in the discussion forums and/or through providing recorded discussions. Both of these provide added value for the students to learn the information or reinforce concepts that they have read about in the required course materials. Faculty who are merely posting assignments, notes and grading materials are acting more as a teaching assistant. In my opinion this type of style does not further the student's learning. The students are more or less taking the class as an independent study with little or no instructor guidance.
- Online offerings should be just one more part of Ferris' mission, in a similar manner to the way that laboratory and lecture sections are part of the mission. We should not move away from what we have done so well over all these years (classroom instruction) to trip over ourselves running for new sexy modes of instructional delivery, especially if the primary reason for this running is to save $$$$.
- Fully online courses should replace the current off campus locations. Having faculty drive long distances to teach is very expensive, not cost effective and hard on the instructors.
- On-campus students taking an online course that is also offered F2F should be avoided. In may experience, another concern is the presentation of online course delivery to a cohort which normally meets during the same time in a F2F environment. Collusion seems to be higher and course design to limit such activity is essential. ======= If a student signs up for an online program, they should have absolute priority over those that wish to take a single course online. ======= I am offended that general education somehow deems itself more important than a student's major course area. On the contrary, I believe that we should identify the bear minimum course cost for online delivery, and as long as ANY course can cover the minimum cost plus a profit for the university, the course should be allowed. However, I also believe this should be the model for F2F courses and for all summer courses (online or F2F). ============ Who and what do we wish to be? I don't think that there should be a target number. It should happen by desire, not by design. To force a quota or push toward a desired end, we will hurt quality and move without full consideration of consequences and institution of proper policies. Once we exceed the 50% level, will be perceived as a Phoenix wannabe? Do we want to be considered an online campus or a traditional campus? Perhaps our students are best to decide this.
- These questions need to be more nuanced to include mixed delivery models which address many of the problems of the online environment, i.e. assessment and academic honesty. They seem heavily biased toward 100% online models

Organization of Online

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral or No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The University should create an Online College, where all services supporting online would be housed.	14 (8.0%)	36 (20.5%)	45 (25.6%)	37 (21.0%)	44 (25.0%)
	50 (28.5%)			81 (46.0%)	
The University should create a unit/department within Academic Affairs that is FerrisOnline.	16 (9.1%)	43 (24.4%)	54 (30.7%)	31 (17.6%)	30 (17.0%)
	59 (33.5%)			61 (34.6%)	
The University should decentralize its online activities, with each college providing the full range of services that support online, including instructional design, technology support, etc. acknowledging, that colleges would likely receive no additional resources to fulfill this task.	13 (7.4%)	25 (14.2%)	44 (25.0%)	46 (26.1%)	48 (27.3%)
	38 (21.6%)			94 (53.4%)	
Ferris should hire faculty whose primary assignment is online teaching and are members of the online unit as well as the college that houses the program.	14 (8.0%)	22 (12.5%)	49 (27.8%)	52 (29.5%)	35 (19.9%)
	36 (20.5%)			87 (49.4%)	

What recommendations do you have about how online learning should be organized at Ferris?

- There seems to be an underlying assumption that there is something wrong with our online efforts. More and more FerrisConnect is becoming a feature of face to face and the blending of these tools in face to face and hybrid will make the fully online more accessible for students if we take care to introduce these tools in our curricula in some sort of logical, strategic fashion. Neither student demand nor putting courses out there because the faculty member wants to do it online are responsible ways of determining what should be offered online. We need to step back and ask questions about student learning and best pedagogy and the way technology can enhance understanding of a discipline before we try to make everything uniform across campus.
- No more administrative structures - just improve and tweak.
- On-line teaching should not be provided to new or adjunct faculty until they can prove they know what they are doing.
- I think the programs need to stay with the colleges and maintain the quality of the originating program. Let the programs remain the content experts.
- Our college is not even permitted to replace faculty who have left, I do not support our department trying to oversee online learning. Faculty should be flexible enough to teach face2face and online courses well. Faculty should be members of one college only.
- While I disagree with the idea of creating another layer of administration it is probably necessary to promote and manage a transition into providing online classes and dealing with the issues that that will create as it relates to staffing, load, faculty support and student support.
- Online should NOT be the responsibility of each individual college if we are to provide a comprehensive and high-quality online presence. Somewhere, there needs to be standardization and oversight. .
- Decentralize and allow decisions to be made on a department/college basis.
- Please do not parcel this out to each college. A major impediment to logical change at FSU is the lack of centralization. From classroom scheduling to technology and classroom upgrades to phone bills too much has been decentralized. If anything all physical and technical resources need centralized and removed from academic affairs. Let academic affairs focus on academics...not where money for software upgrades or new projectors will come from.
- Online is just a mode of delivery and need not require a separate organizational unit. All faculty should be able to teach within this mode.
- The courses and their instruction need to be owned by the college providing the classes so that there is content quality driven by the appropriate colleges. I have not had any difficulty receiving assistance from the FSU staff as it is currently provided.
- Let each school decide priorities and level of support
- While I feel it would be ideal to have each college providing their own online services and activities, I don't think this can be done effectively without additional resources. Budgets are already stretched thin, as is faculty time, and I think this wouldn't get us any further than we are currently.
- There are several basic models to look at. Decentralize or Centralize are the two most common. Each has pros and cons, but a blended approach may work best. I have worked in both. Very costly for Centralize approach and may have disconnect with the programs. Decentralize, there are no standards and everyone is working differently. A blended method is best.a

decentralize approach with the programs having say in who, what and when online/blended courses need to be offered and a centralize approach for support for faculty, students and staff.

- Assuming it would require additional resources to create an online college or a unit within Academic Affairs for FerrisOnline, I'm wondering why a decentralized approach to online activities would receive NO additional resources (as is happening now). It seems to me that this approach represents an effort to add yet another administrative layer (at no small cost, I am certain) rather than to support the decentralized approach that is already going on with additional resource. I also think that departments and colleges know and understand their courses best and how best to support faculty in creating online courses that use best practices tailored to particular disciplines and that provide excellent learning environments for students rather than using a one-size-fits-all, centralized approach. Centralizing this function is a bad idea.

- Ii don't think more academic bureaucracy is the answer! We need knowledgeable technicians to provide support for the technological aspects, but the academic departments should be entirely responsible for content and program decisions. For example, I think it is very reasonable for one department to refuse to offer online courses to freshmen whereas another department may find it acceptable. All coursework is not equally amenable to online delivery and some courses require more student maturity. I don't see why a university-wide, one-size-fits-all policy needs to implemented. Finally, if the university is unwilling or unable to commit more resources to the technology, then we probably have not business trying to expand the online program.

- I do not believe that online organizational structure(s) are necessary or desirable.

- Put the courses in local control, at the department levels. We don't need more administrators or new colleges.

- Look at the models provided by other universities that have preceded Ferris in online education.

- Maximum decentralization....keep it at the faculty/department level.

- I thought CPTS was the off campus and online unit. In these budgetary times, we cannot afford to increase overhead. The last item is disturbing. In fact, we need a wide range of expertise in our online courses that are already employed to meet other needs. We maximize the effective use of resources by increasing the ability of faculty with given expertise to teach in both face to face and online environments as needed.

- We already have Online College. It is called CPTS.

- Develop a School of Distance Learning and recruit people to provide on-line instruction in all subjects that can be delivered in this format.

- Are the options really completely separate or completely decentralized with no additional resources? Seriously? How about completely separate yet acknowledging the completely separate unit would likely receive no additional resources? Of course that can't happen. You can't create a new department without funding, so why is it acknowledged that if it remains decentralized there wouldn't be funding? This seems to be very slanted in the choices offered. A completely separate department is not the answer nor is an unfunded decentralized mandate. Every department has different needs, but there are also similarities. Departments can learn from each other, so I think the sharing and discussion between departments is important. There needs to be funded support, but there also needs to be diversity that allows for individual college/department needs.

- Try not to overcomplicate the matter. Just provide tools to the faculty to teach the course and be available to provide technical support. Allow the departments to determine faculty who are permitted to teach. Treat it as a normal class.

- We have too many colleges as it is. There are 11 deans and 7 VP's. Other Universities of similar size have 4-5 deans and 3-4 VP's. That's a lot of cost saving. See CORE team updates.

- College should have right to decided what curriculum goes online and who teaches it. Support should come from a central point just as it is now. Each college could not support the design, support, etc with no additional monies. We need to have student technology support. We are not having any student complaints about getting help at this time. Leave it alone.

- Standards should be made with the department of the programs! One size does not fit all; each program or department needs to set their standards based on program needs.

- Ferris should hire qualified faculty, regardless of the medium of instruction. Does data exist to prove that online faculty are an entity; that current faculty cannot be trained to be quality online instructors?

- I believe a 'dual appointment' through the college of instruction (e.g. nursing) and the online college would meet the needs for standardized quality. It would also enhance the sense that we online faculty are connected in some way to the University. I, for one, would love to increase my exposure to other disciplines within the University. I teach in the College of Nursing at Ferris. I believe that nurses learn best in 'community', which is feasible in the online classroom. I believe that the way course work is delivered to disciplines needs regulation by both the college of that discipline and an oversight college, such as an 'online university'. I would like to see data collected on students that would assist the faculty in their assessments of the learners and would be available for research as a data base (such as a learning style assessment, or dropout rates in students who take a preparatory course in online learning versus no preparation).

- The main thing is that we do not become a for-profit school. Online has its place but we also need flexibility with respect to the f2f classes.

- The teaching side doesn't need re-organization - the support side does. Ferris should have an academic computing unit.

- If you created an online college, it would get additional resources. Give those resources to the colleges responsible for teaching the courses. It sounds a whole lot like you guys have your minds made up and just want to be able to say that you

did a survey and you'll skew the results to support your already pre-conceived ideas and plans. Is the faculty skeptical and distrustful? You bet!

- Look into Moodle as an online learning system.
- I have found that even Web-Enhanced online learning takes more hours to support that a traditional face to face class. Students expect the instructor to not only be available at office hours, before and after class but also online throughout the day. This is more time consuming than either online alone or face to face alone. The extra hours out of a faculty's day MUST be taken into account when faculty loads are assigned (which in my area they currently are not).
- The university should continue to provide centralized online expertise, training, and selection/review of common online tools. Also the university should continue to provide those resources or facilities that are not practical for colleges to 'own'. Colleges should lead planning of online program offerings and faculty teaching in those programs should belong to the same faculty group as those teaching face to face.
- Leave the class and faculty in their field. The online community is going to continue to grow and may be over 1/3 of each college.
- I absolutely & totally think that all academic content & delivery should be based in the colleges.
- While I think there are pros and cons to both centralizing and decentralizing online functions, if we do opt to decentralize them, we're going to need at least a university-wide set of standards/best practices.
- On-line courses should be taught by adjunct faculty, not the highest paid campus faculty.
- This survey seems to be promoting online as being our future goal. Is this what we want to be come? I place with professors sitting in front of computers instead of standing in front of students. Yes, there is a place for online teaching, but it should to support good teaching and learning and not to replace it. We need to be cautious about replacing the personal contact between teachers and students. Many students would have failed and dropped out of school if it had not been for personalized attention given to them by teachers, human beings, standing in front of them and sitting down with them to encourage and motivate them to do their best. A lot of high quality teaching is nonverbal. It depends on seeing students' facial expressions and observing body language. A good teacher will see signs and traits of confusion, sadness, I need help, and depression in their students and call them in for personalized help, motivation, encouragement, and attention. Sometimes a pat on the back, a smile, and words of encouragements makes a tremendous difference. These things are not possible in an online class where the student cannot be seen.
- Instructional designers should be in the specific college and located in close proximity to the faculty so they can be utilized.
- Based on the questions above, it appears that the option to decentralize is not being encouraged. Perhaps each college should have representation and funding for an online college - not unlike FLITE's model with dedicated liaisons who specialize in specific content areas. If an Online College is required for Ferris to seriously assign required people, dollars and equipment to online learning then we should go forward. But online learning may (and likely) will be different in the various colleges who have diverse students and different business drivers. So we will need to strike a balance between policies and procedure decisions at a global university level versus what could be decided by the online college.
- Online is a delivery method, not a program or department. It should be integrated with the existing programs and departments, so that course content is managed along with traditional offline content.
- If you decentralize and hire faculty that only teach online, you will again help create yet another us and them groups. Take the college of business; there are two cultures because there are two buildings for offices. Look for example in the COB were the full time non-tenured faculty and part time faculty have their offices. We want them teaching the same students, but we don't mingle with them....hmmmmm.
- Our structure should 1. Push people to do on-line courses where outcomes and economics show benefit and 2. Provide efficiencies by economy of scale.
- Orientation at the university level, courses at the college or program level.
- I do NOT believe that online should be decentralized. Let's have the experts in online learning, planning, and support services working with all the colleges, so quality can be maintained.
- I think it makes sense for this to be planned at the program level accept for college core classes and general education classes. Each program should decide for themselves what the best mix of on-line, on-campus and off-campus classes are. There need to be more support and oversight though of on-line instruction.
- It should be abolished as a waste of time and money.
- I believe the needs/expectations/vision of Online curriculum and delivery differ from College to College and many of the decisions on support, instruction, technology and resources may differ as well. Therefore there should be included in any structural layout the ability to allow different colleges differences in several areas.
- It is a good idea to have centralized training and other types of support. It is essential that decisions regarding goals and assessment be SHARED between said administrative decision-makers and the colleges responsible for the courses. If the administration were interested in team work, rather than preoccupied solely with spreadsheets, this could work nicely.
- The Ferris online courses should not be capped at a level below the face to face courses. The argument that online instructors are less efficient (at least regarding student to teacher ratios) than face to face instructors is embarrassing and absurd.
- It should be consistent and there are other forms that allow for better online learning practiced via many institutions such

as iTunesU which can be both private (password protected) or public. I would strongly suggest you check out some of those podcasts b/c my students love it. It really can make an online learner feel like they are in the classroom.

- If we are serious about online teaching, we need to do it in a stellar fashion.
- I think that there should be some sort of online unit - my thought that it should be housed within the faculty for teaching and learning. I do NOT think that we should hire faculty only for online teaching
- Online Support service should be under academic affairs. Each online course need to be evaluated by EXTERNAL consultants.
- It should be mandatory that each faculty go through online training prior to teaching an online course. An option for existing online instructors would be to evaluate a current or past online class and provide opportunities for improvement to the instructor. Unfortunately, I have heard from students how their online classes were a joke and a waste of their time and money because the instructor did not invest his/her time in the class through active participation.
- Within department, as on-site courses are now, with a sufficient (but not overbearing) support network required for those that require assistance.
- Online courses should be offered by the same programs that offer face to face courses.
- Cost, cost, cost. Duplication of services (and, thus, associated costs) is amazing in Michigan. We see every state college trying to have a foothold in all of the major cities. Universities continue to waste millions of dollars by providing duplicative programming, much of which requires expensive lab space, instead of centralizing such programs in specific universities and requiring student residency at these locations. The last thing we should be doing is repeating that mistake where we have the ability to control it. While decentralizing activities may seem to provide more immediate response and specialized support, the lack of coordination and cross-disciplinary use of knowledge gained simply creates layers of additional costs with little added value. We see this duplication in many ways across our campus already (advising, graduation auditing, to a lesser extent - recruiting and marketing because they do actually maintain specific knowledge of the programs they represent) and should avoid creating more walls between our colleges.
- I believe it should have focused and distinct leadership to move it forward and make it more engaging for students
- Most decisions should be made at the program level

Comments about the organization of our online efforts:
- Do we organize our colleges by method of delivery? Do we have a college of PowerPoint or college of small group discussion? Why would colleges receive no additional resources for supporting online services if the University decentralized its online activities? How much money is in CPTS? Where would this pot disappear to?
- Makes sense to keep tech support centrally organized to increase flexibility of meeting needs.
- I didn't know we were organized!
- CoAH has done a marvelous job of modeling how online can be done, but other colleges haven't followed along as well. Each college can be strengthened in its online offerings with direction and assistance beyond its own resources
- WHAT organization? The mixed messages and confusion have been very frustrating. We have gone from being able to solicit up to $4500 in extra pay to create just about any online class with a page or two of rationale to being discouraged from online efforts. We have gone from having a support mechanism through UCEL to having requests for marketing support swept under the rug. When I ask for support for creation of a simple brochure, I am put off and made to feel that I am a bother. There is no money anywhere to print brochures to support summer classes anymore -- my only choice is to have copies made at the copy center. I sat on a committee called Advancing Online Education for years -- all of the questions in this survey were addressed there every year, with no resolution, and then that committee quietly disbanded with no notice or explanation. I contacted both Robbie Teahen and Kimn Carlton-Smith, the two leaders of that committee, to ask what happened to it, and received no answer from either of them. My department head gave me a draft policy to read about online education that he had received from the VPAA's office. It only contained every-other page. I asked if it was copied wrong, and he told me the PDF only had every-other page. That's why I say WHAT organization? There doesn't seem to be much at present.
- Uniform policies for all please. Also, remove the silly waitlist policy from CPTS and let students register for all courses both online and face-to-face based on their registration date. Thus, the students who need an online class because they are a graduating senior or doing an internship can get their classes first. If they snooze, they lose. In the current system, half of the students (no matter where they live or what they need) drag their feet to registrar and then come beginning at the last minute, get placed on waitlists, and leave us to sort it out and investigate who really needs what. Give the students the responsibility and inform them that they have this responsibility.
- I do believe that fully-online faculty positions would prove both administratively efficient and instructionally effective.
- Acknowledging, that colleges would likely receive no additional resources to fulfill this task - so more work without pay, support or resources? When is this ever a good idea for anyone except those who wish to exploit or take advantage of the free work performed by other people?
- Would the Online College use faculty from the various Academic departments or hire separately? Would faculty be moved to the Online College?
- Meegan Lillis has been a tremendous asset in providing support.

- Needs improvement and expansion. FSU is slipping behind the education leaders and without expanded on-line FSU will experience a downward spiral ending in the closing of many programs.
- I think the online certification that instructors can do through FCTL is great. I like what FCTL is doing to help promote online learning and help both new and experienced online faculty members. The workshops are wonderful in that they support faculty and they help faculty who are interested (self selection) and connect them with like-minded faculty in their own and other departments. This is what fosters strong online learning environments and helps faculty members learn and promote good online teaching/learning practices. I believe having a group like E-MAT, which brings people together from various areas to discuss this, is important.
- University must supply support for faculty training and continue to encourage faculty to take advantage of it.
- Some questions are leading...do they suggest the direction the University is headed, regardless of our input?
- I found the tutorial to be a wonderful introduction to the University. It enhanced my capabilities as an online faculty member significantly, and I have experience in online education! (Both in coursework preparing me for online pedagogy and experience teaching with this format). Because of my specialty of nursing, I feel it is important that the College of Nursing have full control over my 'appointment' as adjunct faculty, but I would welcome a dual appointment to increase my exposure to other disciplines, and expertise in online pedagogical principles.
- Resource constrained, limited vision, too focused internally - needs benchmarks and measures external to FSU.
- The colleges responsible for the courses need to keep control of them or a Ferris degree will mean nothing. All the curriculum development that the departments and colleges have done was for a purpose, right? Faculty hired just to teach online would feel no responsibility to carry out the plan.
- As tools mature, I believe that development and teaching of online courses will become easier and enable greater standardization. While we need to assess and enable online course quality we need to be careful not to establish unnecessary processes.
- We already have too many silos (called colleges) at FSU where each Dean makes his/her own rules. If we are going to be one university let's act like one unified body. Continue to offer e-learning support through FCTL but add more people.
- If each college is responsible for providing its own support for online teaching, then we need to expect that something else will have to be sacrificed in order to fund that. No one has unlimited staff time or budget.
- The university needs to more seriously consider its online strategy, leadership, and alignment of resources to effectively support online initiatives.
- You are asking the right questions, but not always providing the information/data to make an educated answer.
- Make some decisions, gather the data, and move forward.
- I don't believe CPTS is the best organizational structure for providing this massive task of online support. I think FSU-GR has its own priorities and needs, and the other off-campus physical sites need to be supported as well.
- I have served on Robbie's prior committees and I know that faculty opinion on most of the survey items differ greatly from college to college. This is why my department has been very independent in the way we serve our students in the fully online curriculum!
- We are primarily an in-seat university. I believe that online should only be used where necessary, not as a replacement for in-seat learning.
- What organization?
- Is there a double standard here? It seems like creating an online college or unit would be funded and provided resources, yet an unnecessary duplication of current services. However, assigning new instructional tasks and increasing workload within current academic colleges would be denied funding and additional resources. . . . . so is online education really about the money - not giving it to qualified faculty but creating new jobs that are sort of like faculty but really aren't so anyone lacking professional education and experience can pretend to be a qualified faculty member? And people wonder why there is such waste in government spending.
- I think the Online College and FerrisOnline are good ideas to explore.
- I think that we should support the faculty in their desire to teach online - that is offer courses - or money to send them to learn about online course development - much in the way that we support our faculty who teach on campus. Teaching is teaching, and learning multiple techniques to apply to your teaching styles should be made available whether the teacher is online or in person.
- Thanks for taking the time to obtain the feedback. Hopefully, the result will be a robust, technically sound online program that can is recognized nationwide and eventually worldwide.
- 12 years ago, the efforts at peer universities to assist the transformation to online put our university in the bottom-dwelling minor leagues. For example, 16 instructional designers at the time compared to less than one here. More than a decade has passed and we have yet to exceed three designers, choosing instead to place the burden of course design upon our faculty - taking great advantage of those who have an unusually high desire to develop these skills and to promote our university. Those not involved in online learning scoff at those who have been working hard to develop these emerging technologies - believing that the latter are somehow trying to get out of work by having computers substitute for their teaching performance. We now have hundreds of courses on line with little control over what we are offering. The worst professor, the worst public speaker, can still get in front of a classroom and somehow survive the course - much to the students'

detriment. To do the same online causes much greater harm - to the students and the reputation of that professor and this institution. While we have little control over how a professor prepares for a F2F, we have a bigger issue with online. Like ice hockey--in which you must master the basic skills of skating before becoming proficient at the game of hockey--before teaching online one must become proficient in the use of the technology, specific course management tool, and the skill of instructional design in order to attain proficiency in online delivery. The (contractual or professional) inability to sit in the class and actually affect a professor's delivery in a F2F environment exists for the online environment as well. However, this can be mitigated by requiring online delivery medium to be created (or at least critiqued and approved) by qualified instructional designers. We MUST move toward this end if we plan to attain and retain the respect of our students and their employers.

Recognizing that not everything can be addressed at once, what one improvement do you believe needs to happen to enhance Ferris' online offerings and/or support?

- Training Professors on how to use the online system.
- Strong guidance in quality online course design and delivery.
- Keep on campus students and lower division students out of fully online courses
- Have more online courses.
- ADJUNCTS need to be watched extremely carefully if they are teaching on-line. Adjuncts should not be allow to teach on-line unless they pass the same rigorous training as full time faculty
- Decide who we are before deciding that on-line is needed in a big way. Does moving to more on-line courses support our mission? If we move more towards on-line with the current perceived on-line class caps, we will become insolvent in a short time. IT infrastructure and staff are insufficient to support a large presence in on-line classes. We cannot be all things to all people and keep our niche in the market.
- Graphics intense classes need some attention for online delivery. Otherwise I am happy with all the support offered and the infrastructure thereof.
- Faculty teaching online need to demonstrate the ability to teach online!
- Student readiness for online learning. Provide support for any first time online student prior to starting an online course. I currently have a fully online student who doesn't have internet access at home and thinks it is reasonable to check into the course once or twice a week. Makes group work very frustrating for peers.
- Ensuring quality of instructors AND ability of students of manage the online environment.
- Instructional designers who spend 1 day/month at different FSU locations for professional development. This would assist in planning online instruction.
- Post an excellent on-line course model that faculty can review for ideas and structure.
- The demands of students needs to be high online and in person. In no way should the technology (Ferris Connect) detract from the demands or execution of courses - at this point I find it often causes an impediment in both cases.
- Administrative acknowledgment of the increased workload that the creation, delivery and maintenance of an online course places on faculty members who teach them. Not only the creation of an online course but the teaching of a quality online course is significantly more time consuming than teaching face-to-face. Faculty load and work production metrics need to be adjusted and supported to recognize this!
- Strengthen the technology and infrastructure first.
- Having enough sections to meet demand especially when courses that on campus students need are only offered in the online format.
- Many faculty are doing an exemplary job of online teaching. I am one of them (Susan K. Jones, Professor of Marketing). Instead of trying to dumb down what good online teachers are doing, trying to create new barriers for good online teachers, etc. Why not ask us for help and advice and really listen to it?
- Be competitive, and be a leader in the world of online education, in addition to high quality on campus education.
- Computer orientation including use of Word.
- We need to manage our growth and communicate that plan to all students.
- We need the best online instructional system we can afford and the tech support keeps both students and faculty happy. ALL students need to complete a uniform orientation before taking an online class. There is a wide variety of approaches to online and one department may not adequately prepare their students for other departments. Parceling this very import task out to departments or colleges is a mistake. CENTRALIZE, CENTRALIZE, CENTRALIZE
- Let's get on with a centralized online effort and stop studying what other colleges have known and been doing for a decade...
- Assurance of appropriate faculty skills in course design and operation for those tasked with teaching online. Still too much variance.
- Decide on a standardized University-wide cap for classes.
- Training & support for faculty who want to teach on-line.
- Instruction/orientation for adjunct instructors. Many of them could use a blended course but because they have full time

jobs elsewhere, they are unable to participate in standard sessions. Because they haven't had the orientation, Ferris Connect is not a tool that they can use. Continue to offer more web connect sessions for additional training as I am located at an off campus location.

- Move to the real version of Blackboard.
- I think an online orientation for students would be a good place to start. It would also allow more discussions and research to take place before making larger changes to the online teaching processes.
- Focus on the centralization of the online/blended offerings and the support.
- Hire people who are capable and make sure they are meeting some set of standards.
- Better review of on-line courses
- FerrisConnect meets my needs - but it also aggravates me and is notoriously unreliable according to the students.
- Before students are allowed to enroll in any online course, they need to either complete an orientation module or otherwise demonstrate their understanding of what participating in an online course means. And, by their continued enrollment in such a course agree to its conditions.
- I find Blackboard to be a cumbersome, poorly designed system. Surely there must be something more user friendly out there.
- 1) Fix some of the deficiencies in FerrisConnect 2) Launch experiment with fully online faculty loads
- More support for faculty teaching online in the form of development grants and other opportunities.
- Remove the barriers to online learning; remove the restrictions such as prohibiting on campus students from taking online courses. Why restrict the students from the opportunity to take online courses?
- Accountability of all OL courses. Each dept. head should know which classes are OL & have reviewed them.
- I believe that new adjunct faculty with no prior teaching experience should be required to demonstrate competency. I do not believe that should be the responsibility of other faculty members to try to teach them how to teach, set up their courses or monitor them.
- Don't restrict access to online courses. Must be available to students in residence as well as distance.
- 1. We need a concrete plan for where we want to increase our offerings and provide support for that expansion. It will not happen spontaneously. 2. Have identified experts in various areas of online instruction identified within departments and colleges. Make the experts local and available. 3. I don't know exactly how to accomplish this, but we need to make certain that students are able to meet the work load expectation of online courses and do not simply think of them as something they can get to eventually. Student attitudes towards online courses need to be aligned with the reality that these courses require as much work or more than face to face courses. Far too many students have told me that they signed up for the online course because they didn't think it would be much work and would be a lot easier than face to face.
- If education and scholarship are priorities here then being able to distinguish competent hardworking professionals and the occasional self-promoting, blowhard seems essential. Then administrators being willing to encourage the ineffective person to retire or leave at the end of a semester or academic year (or never hiring them in the first place) is important so the more competent (often younger, newer, untenured or adjuncts who are paid less but perform better) can stay. All of which needs to be done in a manner to promote respect and cooperation about individuals, units, etc., to create this best possible educational opportunities that we can.
- Do not increase online growth at the sake of depriving resources on the Big Rapids campus. Growth is great and desired but the University's image comes largely from the Big Rapids campus, its faculty, staff, administrators and facilities.
- Repair the Ferris Connect tutorial. It isn't working and TAC was surprised to find this out.
- FerrisConnect/Blackboard does NOT support effective online teaching/learning. There are too many errors in the program and too many archaic ways of doing things (one example is the GradeBook function). One Blackboard version to consider adopting is called Blackboard 9. Eric Kunnen at Grand Rapids Community College can give specifics on the program, which GRCC piloted during summer 2010, and fully adopted in Fall 2010. The program is MUCH more user friendly. An example... in the GradeBook program, one has only to set up one calculated column. After that, every graded column is AUTOMATICALLY figured into the formula set up in the calculated column, so grades are AUTOMATICALLY updated as one puts in new grades.
- Upgrade Blackboard Orient students prior to enrolling in online courses. Assess student readiness to learn in a distance learning setting.
- Orientation for all online learners prior to beginning any online course or program.
- A committee or college that establishes a need for which courses need to be offered online, and which ones, perhaps, should not be.
- I think that every department should offer some online course sections to students. Not every department provides online classes. I recently was talking to a student attending a community college that was planning to attend Ferris, but decided against it because he didn't want to live in Big Rapids full time and he discovered that the program he wanted to go into wasn't available at the other Ferris sites and the program didn't offer any online course options.
- Any change in platform needs to meet or exceed the current FerrisConnect platform.
- Additional personnel to support faculty efforts in this area.
- Replace FerrisConnect with more reliable system that is not so picky about browser and java versions plus timing out on

students. The chat function is rather quirky and the assessment tool (grading spreadsheet) is very cumbersome to work with. There has got to be a better way.

- Tenure track or five year contracts for on-line instructors to hold onto them. Invest in developing their skills until they become the very best.
- See other comments.
- Voluntary Web Design Training for faculty.
- Need to continue to work on a good orientation to Learning systems that all Colleges can use for incoming students. The present orientation needs to be updated.
- By program or department, long term goals needs to be established and if needed faculty should be given release time to learn technology to support online learning.
- Support for the enhancement of faculty capabilities for more effective delivery of online programming.
- Consistency from course to course must be increased
- This survey was all about people - students, faculty, and instructional designers, it never mentioned that we don't have an infrastructure that can handle additional online courses. We don't have enough storage for our current offerings. Until we get the support piece figured we have NO business creating more online offerings. Also, we have to figure out how to manage the course loads. Not all face-to-face courses have the same capacity and not all online classes should have the same capacity.
- Current online offerings need to be assessed for consistency of quality of instruction. Get us all on the same page before you begin turning more pages over.
- An orientation module or course that all online students must take prior to beginning their program of study that includes an assessment of learning style (e.g. Kolb learning inventory).
- academic standards and improvement of technology
- More sections.
- One of my biggest concerns is that some my students have a REALLY hard time getting into online courses because they are here on campus. While I recognize that the online courses were created for off campus students, there are times when my students MUST take an online course either because that is the only format in which the course is being offered or because they go home for the summer, they have to work to make money to stay in school, etc. This creates a stressful situation for these students. If it is a required course, they should get priority before students who just need an online course for Gen Ed requirements and could take other courses.
- There must be a review process to remove instructors who opt to teach online so they can have an easier load. This type of disregard for online learning destroys the credibility of our curriculums.
- Stable, responsive, feature rich platform.
- Make sure that the faculty are involved and informed in a timely manner about changes to the platform. Don't be so enamored of online that you forget that students' face-to-face contacts with professors are catalysts for growth in ways that online (oh, goody, I can do it in my pj's) contacts will not.
- The hiring of a full-time instructional designer with a specialization in online learning.
- Go into online learning carefully---think about the impact of classroom teaching when adding more online opportunities. More is not always better, whatever the cost advantages.
- See prior feedback paragraph.
- Online policies (such as course caps, rewards for online development, etc.) should be established and standardized. Continue work to enable flexible, non-credit courses, seminars, and training to hosted in a common environment and structure as for credit.
- Require faculty to demonstrate some basic skills required for online teaching. A colleague teaches online but she only uses the e-mail tool in Ferris Connect..... That's it! How sad is that?
- Better technical support, better software. More integration of library resources.
- Instructors need to be made aware of the library resources that are available to online/distance students. The fact that they cannot physically come to the library does NOT mean they can't access FLITE's materials and services. We even have librarians who do live webinars for distance/online classes, so that those classes can have the same introduction to library resources and research skills that on-campus students do. If we could get at least a link to the library's web page and where to get help from a librarian into every online course, it would go a long way toward making sure that online students have the support that's necessary if they're to do quality research.
- Get rid of FerrisConnect and install the new Blackboard system--Give us faculty the tools and we'll figure out the rest!
- Consider learning outcomes and cost effectiveness.
- The first step is to decide, based on facts and not someone fancy, which course lend themselves to being taught online and which will be less effective when taught online. I would be delighted to participate in working to establish which courses are best suited for online and which would be less effective if taught online. Robert Friar, 591-2542
- A long-term technology support plan that addresses the need to continue to make cutting edge technology available to faculty teaching online, and students taking classes online. Ongoing training and development for faculty in the form of workshops and instructional designers should also be built into that plan and offered through the Center.

- I think somehow ensuring that the faculty teaching online courses are effective in that venue is critical. Some faculty who are effective in the face to face are not necessarily in the online area. I would hate to see student learning deteriorate because the online course is not being effectively taught. Some of the ideas presented in this survey could go a long way toward ensuring that there is some oversight and education provided that would enhance the quality of course instruction.
- Stop doing on-line maintenance on Thursday nights. I suggest Sat. nights
- Work to create continuity and use the Faculty Center as the hub or resource.
- Better choices about the actual hardware and software used to deliver course content– focus on providing transparent user experiences that do not hinder or prevent fast, easy access to course content.
- Train the students ahead of time and screen them!!!!! Sometimes it seems like the remote locations just take their money and run. A training video does not cut it! You need to see them to know its them doing it!
- More faculty going through training and having their online courses periodically reviewed by FCTL personnel.
- Find a product which addresses multiple concerns instead of finding a solution for each concern. It's easier to manage a unified platform for 5 solutions than 5 platforms for 5 different solutions.
- Require student orientation for online courses.
- Do NOT diminish the important of in-class teaching.
- Make sure we have resources and oversight to deliver high-quality learning and collect the data demonstrating that students achieve the learning desired. Evidence should drive our decisions, not opinion.
- Orientation at the university level prior to admission to an online program or taking an online course
- Requiring all online teaching/offerings to be run through one platform, currently FerrisConnect. If you have a personal webpage, put the link up in FerrisConnect. If you want to use textbook offerings, make them available through FerrisConnect. This random online hodgepodge (student says she is taking five courses with five different ways to access online material) is not helpful to our students.
- Please make more general education offerings made available online.
- More instructional support in CTL - they need to hire more Meegans.
- In the modern world, individuals need to learn how to interact face to face with real people. Online courses only contribute the further decline in personal communication skills that is so prevalent among young people today.
- In a nutshell it would be Resources - the fully online component of curriculum delivery will only get bigger. If Ferris truly wishes to expand more curriculum to more students, then additional resources are required for both student needs and faculty needs.
- Make the basic structure of the online courses consistent!
- Change your motivation for getting into online courses. Instead of seeing $ signs, consider how we could offer/deliver courses that would be respected and valued by students, and employers. This won't happen by going through the motions and putting a pretty marketing package on it, and 'saying' faculty are so important, but really not even trying to listen when they explain how these courses need to be set up and managed.
- ASK ME!!!!! What I need for my classroom instructional technology and provide it! I use the same computers four days each week yet I have to re-install some of the same software every single day (clean slate) because apparently the classroom computer is set up for someone else - maybe IT staff, who update or use these computers less than most once a month. I use many of the same bookmarked websites and software every semester in the same classrooms, yet at the start of most semesters I need to call to have the software re-installed on the classroom computer. I have learned over time to never count on the classroom computer to have what I need, always have a back-up plan for when something is missing or blocked, having something work on the office computer means nothing for having it work in class, and if I really want to do some computer-based (online) learning activity in class then I need to come in early that day and set it up myself. The same applies to putting material on FerrisConnect - there are no guarantees that it will work whenever students are trying to access that material.
- A center with more support for faculty would like to blend their courses and eventually offer a fully online course. Currently the infrastructure is not set in place for that to make it easy on faculty.
- 24/7 support
- A good platform. FC (Vista) is pretty good. Blackboard is poor. How do you assess student learning if you do not have test stats or you can not just return an assignment with side comments and have a resubmit? How do you adjudicate issues with students if you cannot trace (track) attendance?
- The faculty needs to be held accountable for their teaching - just like on main campus. I feel that the move to have faculty removed from the main campus is a huge mistake. Students need to be able to have the access whether or not they take advantage of the situation.
- Assessment of Online delivery by external consultants.
- Student online preparation and faculty online teaching requirements.
- FerrisConnect is one of the biggest obstacles to electronic learning on this campus, either in online, mixed, or even enhanced courses. When looking at electronic learning systems, it is important to evaluate expansion/upgrading possibilities and usability, not primarily cost. Sometimes you get exactly what you pay for.
- POLICY! The obvious special treatment of certain faculty or faculty groups that teach on line is disheartening. Truly, it kills

morale and grows dissent to allow one unit or individual to run a course with only a few students (while receiving full pay) while requiring 30 or more in another section (sometimes similar courses, different professors). This discredits our online initiatives with our colleagues, drives some from actually joining the effort, and enraging the opposition to any expansion of online development. CAPS are important, as is equal treatment of all faculty. The standardization of delivery systems (CMS - not allowing self-contained courses in some external location like a Google or Yahoo space), the review of course delivery media/structure/organization, the consideration of course loads, etc., all affect this effort.

- Continue to be innovative and open to new ideas for best practice for online education.
- I would house online teaching in the University College or keep it where it is. I do not recommend hiring separate faculty. We need more faculty on campus.
- I believe a formal training program with requirements for teacher qualifications validated
- student orientation to online/ pass test of skills
- a comprehensive Portfolio option that can follow a student from year one past graduation