



Co-curricular Assessment Report

Program/Department Name: Estarkstate
Year of CAR Completion: 2019-2020
CAR Cycle: 2017-2018, 2018-2019, 2019-2020

Co-curricular Assessment Report

Organization of Program Review Materials:

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

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

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

Component I

Response to Previous Co-curricular Assessment Report

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

Program/Department: eStarkState

Strengths:

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

Areas for improvement:

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

assessment, Course Content Checklist review for faculty contracts, degree review, and other department tasks are delayed.

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

Opportunities:

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

Threats:

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

- Faculty who underestimate the time and challenges of teaching online. Despite the required training, there are many who struggle with the technology and do not put forth the time needed to engage students online.
- Poorly prepared students. The orientation does a good job of highlighting the pluses and minuses of learning online and the amount of time that students need to spend online. Despite that, there are students who do not possess the technical skill or take the time that online learning requires.
- College Credit Plus student understanding of what it means to be a college student.

Progress to Date:

We continue to focus our efforts on providing support and services to faculty and students. During this period, we have:

- Focused our efforts to find technical tools to assist faculty with creating engaging learning content for students.
- Increased our outreach efforts to faculty to educate and inform them about best practices in online teaching.
- Articles and videos are added weekly to support faculty and student users.
- Continuous improvement in all the training classes. Course content reflects input from faculty and students.
- During this period, we had one course receive Quality Matters™ (QM) certification and two courses received recognition as Blackboard Exemplary Courses.
- SSC was recognized as one of the Top 50 Best Online Community Colleges.
- The Instructional Designer has been recognized by QM for her creation of QM4Design, a tool used to align learning objectives with course activities. She has presented at several QM conferences.
- Educational Technologist completed her Master's Degree in Instructional Design.
- Implemented Respondus Lockdown Browser with Monitor to support secured testing at non-SSC locations.
- Working with faculty to design courses that meet ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) requirements.
- eSS used their skills and technology to support staff around the College. We have created engaging learning content for Human Resources, Digital Library, Disability Support Services, Military Services, Career Services, Admissions and Enrollment Services.
- We provide video recording services for faculty.

Component II

Review of Previous Assessment Data

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

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

During this assessment period, we created two new blogs, one for faculty and one for students. Each blog contains articles and videos to support using the systems and technologies required for online learning. We update the articles and continually add new articles and videos.

- Faculty Blog - <https://www.starkstate.edu/efaculty>
- Student Blog - <https://www.starkstate.edu/eStudent/>

The QM4Design Rubric was designed to support course design. This document was designed to bring course design, course content and learning objectives together in a seamless and easy to use manner. Faculty are finding it much easier to connect learning objects with intended outcomes. In addition to improving the design process, the courses are higher quality with students achieving better outcomes.

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

Our department has less people than it had during the last assessment. We continue to leverage technology in order to offset the lack of staff to assist with supporting faculty and students at the College. We increased the number of blog articles and videos we use to support faculty and students. Our training courses follow continuous improvement models and are updated regularly based on feedback from users. We have added training classes based on feedback.

Component III

Criteria for Co-curricular Assessment Report

Criterion 1.0 Mission, Values and Goals

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

Values: eStarkState achieves its mission by maintaining a high standard of integrity and performance, providing strong collaboration with faculty in creating an educational environment that supports student learning.

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

*Goals should align with current SSC Strategic Plan.

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

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

Criterion 2.0 Baseline Data

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

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

The QM4Design Rubric has been created to guide the creation of course design. It is used to connect course content to measurable objectives (Course, Program and General). The QM4Design Rubric brings The Quality Matters rubric is a national quality assurance rubric, comprising standards, which measures and guaranties the quality of an online course. Our version of the rubric creates a usable format for course designers to use to be sure that the design course matches approved outcomes. Upon



completion of the course design, the course is assessed and if design standards are met, the course receives an Excellence in Course Design badge (Web 2 or Web 3).

As a final step in the Stark State College online course design process, the course is assessed to ensure the quality standard is met. eStarkState has also begun the process of submitting courses to Quality Matters to have courses nationally certified. We submitted our first course during the Spring 2019 semester and were approved.

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

The Student Evaluation of Instruction survey is conducted each semester. Periodically a Web 3 vs. non-Web 3 comparative analysis is completed to compare online completion rates with like face-to-face courses. Subsequent course success rates are also tracked using Web 3 vs. non-Web 3 comparisons. Full-time and part-time course persistence rates are also monitored.

The Support Services Effectiveness survey is offered every two years. eStarkState uses the results of those surveys to assess the what needs to be updated or changed in services offered.

Focus groups for faculty and students are conducted as needed.

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

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

In order to increase access, eStarkState tracks the courses offered each semester by modality. That information is then used to evaluate the degrees. We analyze each degree to determine which degrees have a higher percentage of courses offered online. We then work with Department Chairs to determine whether remaining courses in the degree are suitable to one of the online modalities. If the department chair and faculty agree that a course could be offered online, they request approval from the Curriculum Committee and once granted, work with us to design the course for an online modality. This process has allowed us to grow the online degrees and certificates offered at Stark State to 45 (22 degrees, 9 one-year certificates, and 14 less than one-year certificates).

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

Course design involves a strong partnership between faculty and eStarkState. eStarkState constantly evaluates new technologies seeking tools and techniques which allow for the creation of more engaging and efficient learning environments for students.

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

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

We use the data provided to add, modify, and change our training classes. Based on survey results, we are able to find areas that are in need to be addressed or improved.

3.) To improve online course completion rates

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

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

To continuously enhance the quality of eStarkState services

The staff in eStarkState is committed to continuous improvement. We constantly seek opportunities to improve course design and have implemented the Quality Matters rubric and Universal Design for Learning principles in course design. These nationally recognized standards encourage course design that supports the best learning experience for students. Beyond that, we’ve adopted the QM rubric and created a tool that greatly enhances the course design process. We strive to deliver the best in online course design and delivery every day to our students.

Criterion 2.0 Program/ Departmental Assessment Procedure and Action Plan

Program/Department Name: eStarkState
Individual Completing Report: Linda C. Morosko
Individual(s) Reviewing Report: Fedearia Nicholson-Sweval
Date: 5/20/2020

Program/ Departmental Assessment Procedure and Action Plan

Purpose:

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

Procedure:

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

Directions:

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

Assessment Criteria

Goals:

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

Yes X No

Outcome Measures:

Are direct and indirect outcome measures identified for each goal?

Yes X No

Research:

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

Yes No

Findings:

Are research results analyzed and interpreted and findings determined?

Yes No

Review Process:

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

Yes No

If no, what are the proposed action steps to meet the Criteria?

Proposed Actions:

Are recommendations acted upon?

Yes No

Improvements:

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

Yes No

Assessment Measures Inventory

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

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

Criterion 3.0: Assessment Results Report

Purpose:

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

Instructions:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Outcome Measure 1: Course Modality Counts

Terms of Assessment: Fall Spring Annual

Findings:

eStarkState Enrollment Data
3-Year - Fall

	% Change Fall 2017	Fall 2019 11-19-19	Fall 2018 12-20-18	Fall 2017 1/5/18
W2 Sections Offered	5%	161	164	154
W3 Sections Offered	4%	427	414	409
W4 Sections Offered	-69%	10	18	32
W2 + W3 + W4 Sections	1%	598	596	595
W2 Unduplicated HC	15%	1,520	1,446	1,323
W3 Unduplicated HC	4%	4,677	4,508	4,499
W4 Unduplicated HC	-30%	109	124	155
W2/W3/W4 Combined Unduplicated HC	4%	5,599	5,427	5,375
College Head Count	3%	11,445	11,346	11,137
%HC (Combined/College)	1%	49%	48%	48%
Web Only Students	4%	1,826	1,734	1,748
W3 Out-of-State Students	13%	18	22	16
W2 FTE	17%	168	167	143
W3 FTE	6%	684	649	643
W4 FTE	-31%	11	13	16

eStarkState Enrollment Data
3-Year - Spring

	% Change Spring 2018	Spring 2020 5-31-2020*	Spring 2019 3/6/19	Spring 2018 5/8/18
W2 Sections Offered	-14.3%	158	181	161
W3 Sections Offered	5.3%	452	431	398
W4 Sections Offered	-20.8%	15	20	24
W2 + W3 + W4 Sections	-1.2%	625	632	583
W2 Unduplicated HC	-7.7%	1,263	1,354	1,188
W3 Unduplicated HC	2.5%	4,799	4,688	4,500
W4 Unduplicated HC	-6.1%	121	129	132
W2/W3/W4 Combined Unduplicated HC	1.3%	5,556	5,487	5,195
College Head Count	-2.2%	10,683	10,918	10,920
%HC (Combined/College)	3.7%	52.0%	50%	48%
Web Only Students	3.5%	2,028	1,964	1,848
W3 Out-of-State Students	-12.5%	20	22	16
W2 FTE	-12.7%	146	163	134
W3 FTE	-3.3%	723	745	659
W4 FTE	-14.3%	13	15	14

* This number represents the courses actually designated as Web 3. In reality, this semester, all courses were offered online due to COVID-19.

Review Committee/Review Process:

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

Improvements:

Comparing semester-to-semester enrollment, enrollment has stabilized at 48-49 percent for Fall and grown slightly to 50-52 percent for Spring. During Spring 2020, all courses moved online due to COVID-19.

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

Outcome Measure 2: Web-based programs and majors

As of Summer 2020, there are 46 online degrees and certificates (23 degrees, 9 one-year certificates, and 14 less than one-year certificates). They are:

Transfer degrees

Associate of arts – general
Associate of science – general
English
Technical degrees

Business

Accounting – Corporate Major
Accounting – CPA Major
Accounting – Tax Major
Accounting – Computer Information Major
Accounting – Health Administration Major
Business management
Business management – entrepreneurship
Business management – health services
Business management – human resources
Business management – Kent State University BBA degree
Business management – sports management
Finance
Marketing and sales management

Human services, social services and public safety

Criminal Justice

Information technology

Computer programming and database
Computer science and engineering
Computer technology
Judicial court reporting
Virtual office professional
Web design and development

Certificates

Business

Banking associate
Bookkeeping
Computer-integrated accounting
Enrolled agent
Entrepreneurship

Information technology

Computer science
Data analytics
Database systems
Web design

Certificates (less than one year)

Business

Entrepreneurship
Tax preparer
Quickbooks payroll

Engineering

Civil/surveying drafting
Department of transportation safety

Health

Medical billing specialist
Medical instrument sterilization

Human and social services

Gerontology

Information technology

C++ programming
Java programming
Microsoft-certified applications professional
Microsoft SQL server
Video game design

Liberal arts

Grant writing

Findings:

eStarkState continues to partner with faculty and department chairs to develop and deliver online courses and certificates.

Review Committee/Review Process:

Each Spring, the Director of eStarkState reviews the curriculum sheets for the upcoming year to discern what programs and certificates are online. Once that has been confirmed, an updated list of degrees and certificates is sent to Marketing to be uploaded to <https://www.starkstate.edu/estarkstate/>.

Improvements:

In Fall 2017, we had 16 online degrees, eight one-year certificates and seven less-than-one-year certificates. Over this period, we added seven degrees, one one-year certificate and seven less-than-one-year certificates.

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

Outcome Measure 1: Quality Matters

Terms of Assessment: Fall Spring Annual

Findings:

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

Review Committee/Review Process:

As part of the online course design process, the QM4Design (an internal document created by eStarkState that connects the Quality Matters rubric to course activities and assessments) rubric is used to assess courses prior to approval to be taught online. eStarkState uses QM4Design to review courses designed by faculty members to be sure that the course falls within the acceptable parameters established by Quality Matters for quality online courses.

Improvements: Stark State College submitted WDD121, Internet Design and Development to Quality Matters during the Spring 2020 semester. This course received QM certification in March. We submitted SSC101, Student Success course Summer 2020.

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

Outcome Measure 2: Student Survey

Terms of Assessment: Fall Spring Annual

Findings:

We created a Technology and Blackboard Survey which was given to students during the Spring 2019 semester. The survey had two goals. The first, to provide us an overview of the technology students use and have access to. The second, to get feedback on Blackboard. We had 366 students participate in the survey.

The information obtained in the survey helps us to understand the technology students use, how comfortable they are with using Blackboard, and areas of training we need to focus on in order to best support students.

84 percent of students had a positive experience with Blackboard. 73 percent felt it was easy to use. We were pleased with the results and will continue to focus on ways to improve the student experience.

Review Committee/Review Process:

Director, eStarkState and Director, Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment

Improvements:

NA, first-time implementing survey, results are baseline for next administration.

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

Outcome Measure 3: Faculty LMS Survey

Terms of Assessment: Fall ____ Spring_2020____ Annual _____

Findings:

Blackboard has been in place now for three years. This was a good time to see how everyone has adapted and where we need to focus training. We conducted the survey and half the respondents were full-time and the other half, adjunct faculty. 215 faculty members responded to the survey. The majority of the information was positive.

31 percent of the respondents have never taught a Web 2, 3, or 4 class. We also asked the faculty which features they use most in Blackboard. We were pleased that 82 percent of the respondents use a Master Course.

We were able to see that we need to start looking at providing more support for audio/video feedback and video creation.

Review Committee/Review Process:

Director, eStarkState and Director, Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment review the data, looking for changes.

Improvements:

NA, first-time implementing survey, results are baseline for next administration.

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

Outcome Measure Four: Faculty Evaluations

Terms of Assessment: Fall __X__ Spring__X__ Annual _____

Findings:

One of the measures that we use to determine effectiveness in online teaching is to compare the evaluations for faculty who teach both online and face-to-face, same instructor, different modalities. Using this measure allows us to have one constant, the faculty member. We then look

at their evaluations to measure the difference in student response between the two modalities. We expect the evaluations to be higher face-to-face than online, because of the face-to-face interaction. The difference between the two modalities, is negligible. This supports the training, course design and preparation faculty do before teaching online.

Fall 15-Spring 19 Faculty Evaluations Comparative Global Index Scores: Web 3 v. Non-Web 3 Courses
 Peter J. Trumpower, Director of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment, 1/8/20

		Global Index Score	Instructor Preparedness	Instructor Knowledge	Instructor Delivery	Instructor Communication	Course Evaluation
Fall 2015	Web 3	4.54	4.69	4.58	4.58	4.62	4.25
	Web-link/Paper	4.71	4.83	4.76	4.70	4.79	4.48
	<i>Difference</i>	-0.17	-0.14	-0.18	-0.12	-0.17	-0.23
Spring 2016	Web 3	4.54	4.70	4.59	4.57	4.60	4.25
	Web-link/Paper	4.72	4.83	4.76	4.71	4.78	4.51
	<i>Difference</i>	-0.18	-0.13	-0.17	-0.14	-0.18	-0.26
Fall 2016	Web 3	4.59	4.74	4.63	4.61	4.67	4.29
	Web-link/Paper	4.70	4.81	4.74	4.69	4.78	4.48
	<i>Difference</i>	-0.11	-0.07	-0.11	-0.08	-0.11	-0.19
Spring 2017	Web 3	4.51	4.67	4.57	4.55	4.56	4.19
	Web-link/Paper	4.72	4.82	4.77	4.72	4.80	4.49
	<i>Difference</i>	-0.21	-0.15	-0.20	-0.17	-0.24	-0.30
Fall 2017	Web 3	4.54	4.68	4.61	4.58	4.63	4.23
	Web-link/Paper	4.69	4.81	4.73	4.67	4.77	4.46
	<i>Difference</i>	-0.15	-0.13	-0.12	-0.09	-0.14	-0.23
Spring 2018	Web 3	4.59	4.74	4.65	4.63	4.66	4.29
	Web-link/Paper	4.70	4.81	4.72	4.68	4.78	4.49
	<i>Difference</i>	-0.11	-0.07	-0.07	-0.05	-0.12	-0.20
Fall 2018	Web 3	4.62	4.77	4.69	4.65	4.67	4.31
	Web-link/Paper	4.71	4.82	4.75	4.70	4.80	4.48
	<i>Difference</i>	-0.09	-0.05	-0.06	-0.05	-0.13	-0.17
Spring 2019	Web 3	4.58	4.70	4.64	4.60	4.68	4.28
	Web-link/Paper	4.71	4.82	4.74	4.68	4.78	4.50
	<i>Difference</i>	-0.13	-0.12	-0.10	-0.08	-0.10	-0.22
Unweighted Average Difference Web3 and Web-link/Paper		-0.14	-0.11	-0.13	-0.10	-0.15	-0.23

Review Committee/Review Process: Director, eStarkState and Director, Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment review the results to ensure similarities between modalities.

Improvements: NA

Goal 3: To improve online completion rates.

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

Terms of Assessment: Fall Spring Annual

Findings:

Fall 2014-Spring 2018 Web 3 v. Non-web Comparative Grade Distribution Summary

Peter J. Trumpower, Director of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment, 11-20-18

Modality	A	B	C	D	F	W	Total grades	Total DFW
Non-web	17,944	14,506	8,723	3,952	8,809	6,301	60,235	19,062
Web 3	12,876	8,472	4,778	2,169	6,144	4,279	38,718	12,592

Modality	A	B	C	D	F	W	DFW Rate
Non-web	29.8%	24.1%	14.5%	6.6%	14.6%	10.5%	31.6%
Web 3	33.3%	21.9%	12.3%	5.6%	15.9%	11.1%	32.5%

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

Review Committee/Review Process:

Director, eStarkState and Director, Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment review the data to ensure similarities between modalities.

Improvements: NA

Goal 3: To improve online completion rates.

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

Terms of Assessment: Fall ___X___ Spring ___X___ Annual _____

This measure was started because there was concern that online classes were not preparing students for subsequent classes. Repeated comparisons show that students who take the first class online are well prepared for the next class in the sequence.

Findings:

Summer 2015-Spring 2019 Web3 v F2F Subsequent Course Success for Select Course Pairs*

Peter J. Trumpower, Director of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment, 1-7-20

Course Pair	Modality	Grade					Grand Total	Total A-C	Pct. A-C
		A	B	C	D	F			
ACC 132 with ACC 221	F2F	11	25	19	12	10	77	55	71.4%
	Web 3	10	8	6	4	1	29	24	82.8%
BIO 101 with BIO 121	F2F	118	148	124	42	48	480	390	81.3%
	Web 3	38	53	38	13	14	156	129	82.7%
BUS 221 with BUS 222	F2F	27	46	46	18	10	147	119	81.0%
	Web 3	5	3	2	1		11	10	90.9%
CHM 101 with CHM 121	F2F	35	35	17	7	8	102	87	85.3%
	Web 3	9	8	7	1	3	28	24	85.7%
CJS 121 with CJS 221	F2F	37	18	7	3	7	72	62	86.1%
	Web 3	1	1				2	2	100.0%
CSE 122 with CJS 229 and 231	F2F	42	38	16	9	16	121	96	79.3%
	Web 3	5	3	3	1	3	15	11	73.3%
ENG 124 with ENG 231	F2F	167	137	37	17	47	405	341	84.2%
	Web 3	5	5	1			11	11	100.0%
HIS 121 with HIS 122	F2F	45	86	57	16	8	212	188	88.7%
	Web 3	1	2				3	3	100.0%
MGT 121 with MGT 221-224	F2F	108	36	16	2	5	167	160	95.8%

MKT 121 with MKT 221	Web 3	17	12	2		1	32	31	96.9%
	F2F	5	7	1		1	14	13	92.9%
PSY 121 with PSY 221	Web 3	5	2	1			8	8	100.0%
	F2F	29	55	35	9	14	142	119	83.8%
SOC 121 with SOC 225	Web 3	5	7	5	1	2	20	17	85.0%
	F2F	147	70	31	9	22	279	248	88.9%
WDD 121 with WDD 221-222	Web 3	7	6	1		1	15	14	93.3%
	F2F	8	2	1		3	14	11	78.6%
	Web 3	2	1				3	3	100.0%
Total	F2F	779	703	407	144	199	2232	1889	84.6%
	Web 3	110	111	66	21	25	333	287	86.2%

* Excludes CCP students

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

Review Committee/Review Process: Director, eStarkState and Director, Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment review results comparing the modalities and looking for changes.

Improvements: NA

Goal 3: To improve online completion rates.

Outcome Measure 3: Outcome Measure Three: FT v PT faculty course persistence

Terms of Assessment: Fall X Spring X Annual

One concern expressed in the past, was that part-time faculty were giving higher grades than full-time faculty. We've tracked this number to be sure there are no anomalies or concerns between the two groups.

Over the years, the number of passing/failing grades between full-time and part-time faculty are comparable. There is no disparity.

Findings:

Fall 2014-Spring 2018 Full-time v. Part-time Web 3 Faculty Comparative Grade Distribution Summary
Peter J. Trumpower, Director of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment, 11-20-18

Faculty status	A	B	C	D	F	W
Full-Time	8,046	4,838	2,758	1,242	3,910	2,517
Part-Time	3,337	2,493	1,342	554	1,867	918
Grand Total	11,383	7,331	4,100	1,796	5,777	3,435

Faculty status	A	B	C	D	F	W
Full-Time	34.5%	20.8%	11.8%	5.3%	16.8%	10.8%
Part-Time	31.7%	23.7%	12.8%	5.3%	17.8%	8.7%

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

Review Committee/Review Process:

Director, eStarkState and Director, Institutional Research reviewed the results and determined there was no significant difference between the groups.

Improvements: NA

Goal 4:

Outcome Measure 1: Support services effectiveness survey

Terms of Assessment: Fall X Spring Annual

Findings:

	Meets personally with you	Speaks by phone with you	Provides help when needed	Exhibits solid understanding of issues	Provides accurate, helpful information	Shows courtesy and respect	Demonstrates appropriate level of confidentiality	Responds in timely manner
2015	3.32	3.42	3.35	3.28	3.34	3.33	3.46	3.28
2017	3.47	3.51	3.44	3.39	3.46	3.38	3.53	3.47
2019	3.60	3.60	3.55	3.50	3.54	3.55	3.68	3.57
eStarkState	Meets personally with you	Speaks by phone with you	Provides help when needed	Exhibits solid understanding of issues	Provides accurate, helpful information	Shows courtesy and respect	Demonstrates appropriate level of confidentiality	Responds in timely manner
2015	B+	B+	B+	B+	B+	B+	B+	B+
2017	B+	A-	B+	B+	B+	B+	A-	B+
2019	A-	A-	A-	A-	A-	A-	A-	A-

	Total responses	Most frequent response type		
eStarkState	N = 26	Helpful/Excellent (n=18)	Additional training for users needed (n=2)	Inconsistent customer service (n=2)

Review Committee/Review Process:

Director, eStarkState and Director, Institutional Research reviewed the results to determine if there were significant changes.

Improvements:

During this review period, the full migration to Blackboard learn occurred and there was a high-level of focus on faculty support. The creation of a new support blog, containing articles and videos, provides faculty support during non-working hours. Our training courses are continuously improved by monitoring the type of support ticket requests. When we see a support topic recur, we amend our training classes, and, add new videos and articles to the blog. Creation of the QM4Design rubric has resulted in an effective method of designing online classes, by more clearly connecting course content to learning objectives.

Goal 4:

Outcome Measure 2: Focus Groups faculty (LMS)

Terms of Assessment: Fall Spring Annual

Findings:

NA – Faculty LMS Focus Groups planned for Spring 2020 were suspended due to Covid-19

Review Committee/Review Process: NA

Improvements: NA

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

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

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

Reflective Narrative Questions:

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

Performance Evaluations are used to assist employees with goals for the upcoming year. It’s a time to discuss what’s working and what’s not in the department. Further, we use the evaluations to discuss how we can best work together.

2. Describe how professional development benefits the program.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Reflective Narrative Questions: v

1. Explain the changing conditions within the field.

Technology is constantly evolving. Increasing use of mobile devices and changes in technology present challenges in delivering online courses. Within the field, we’re seeing an increase in creating more interactive design. We’re working to create more engaging classes by incorporating learning objects that focus on more interactivity. All of these changes require more time in designing courses.

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

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

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

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

Component IV

Recommendations and Executive Summary

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

Program/Department: eStarkState

Strengths:

- Creative and collaborative staff
- Learner-focused course design and development
- Practice continuous reflection and improvement
- Quantity/quality of online courses, programs and certificates
- Since the last CAR, the College fully migrated from ANGEL Learning Management System to Blackboard Learning Management System (LMS). Faculty and students have experienced easier navigation, a more streamlined interface, additional tools, and integration of a variety of outside components that enhance online learning.
- Succeeding Online, Required Orientation, is the required online orientation class for students taking Web 2, Web 3 and Web 4 classes. It teaches students the skills (and allows them to practice those skills) required to use the LMS, along with providing them best practices for learning online.
- Blackboard Basics and Teaching Online are required courses for faculty who want to teach online. Blackboard Basics covers the basic skills a faculty member would need to add content and manage a class in the LMS. Teaching Online introduces faculty to the difference between online teaching and traditional teaching, the importance of instructor presence in an online course, choosing engaging content for your online course, building a community of learners, as well as multiple methods of engagement and assessment for online learners.
- Design Matters is required for faculty designing an online course. It blends best practices in online course design, along with the national standards of the Quality Matters Rubric, to create quality online courses.
- New training courses added during this period include Blackboard: Beyond Basics, and Successful Communication Strategies Using Collaborate
- To increase the quality and availability of support for faculty and students using Blackboard, we created two new blogs, the faculty blog <https://www.starkstate.edu/eFaculty/>, and a student blog, <https://www.starkstate.edu/eStudent/>.
- During this review period, eStarkState created the **QM4Design Rubric**. This tool was developed to streamline the design process and connect course design with course activities and learning objectives (Course, Program and General Learning Objectives).

- Implementation of Universal Design for Learning principles allows us to create an equitable and engaging learning environment for all students. We have created course templates which follow best practices and implement them as often as possible. Providing consistent course design provides clear course and program assessment and student success and engagement.
- eStarkState seeks opportunities to contribute to the college. We are solution providers to both faculty and staff. Over the last three years, we've worked with staff and faculty to create/improve a variety of orientations, tutoring support services and trainings.
 - New Student Orientation, <https://www.starkstate.edu/eStudent/proctored-testing/>.
 - Succeeding Online, Required Orientation for Web 2, 3 and 4 students, located in Blackboard.
 - Physical Therapy Assistant New Student Orientation, located in Blackboard
 - Nursing New Student Orientation, located in Blackboard
 - Military Support Training for faculty, located in Blackboard
 - Science Learning Center Online Tutoring, located in Blackboard
 - Math Learning Center Online, located in Blackboard
 - Returning Student Advising Center Online, located in Blackboard
 - Stark State College New Student Orientation (Online) <https://www.starkstate.edu/nso/>.
- Provide abundant support resources.
- QM certified staff
- Provide support 18 hours a day, seven days a week.
- Manage and update the eStarkState Manual. This is a OneNote notebook located in an online, centralized location. The manual contains all of the instructions and documentation for running all aspects of the department.
- The demand of the new LMS caused other departmental obligations to be put on hold. Starting in Spring/Fall 2019, online course review, ongoing course design, submitting courses to Quality Matters for assessment, Course Content Checklist review for faculty contracts, degree review, and other department tasks was started again.
- Spring 2020, we achieved our first Quality Matters certified course. WDD121, Internet Design and Development holds the distinction of being our first QM Certified course. https://www.qualitymatters.org/reviews-certifications/qm-certified-courses/nojs/1/rev_count/0/Stark.

Areas for improvement:

- Lack of staff. eSS has a staff of three supporting approximately 10,000 users.
- Marketing online programs and classes.
- Hardware and software resources. We support students on mobile devices, PCs, Macs, etc. We support both Mac and Windows operating systems. We need to have hardware with the software we need to serve (e.g. we need to have a Mac, and a PC with Windows 10 on it). Lack of technology/web media/audio/visual support staff, space, software, and other tools.
- Faculty and department chairs who are less than cooperative working with us to design and develop online classes. This includes following and using preferred templates and providing structure to the courses that supports student success and engagement.

- Perceived retention and success of online students. Many constantly state that the success is much lower than F2F, while it is lower; data does not support these claims.
- Rapidly changing technology - with frequent browser updates and many other technology changes, we have to constantly keep up with industry news
- Inability to track # of online graduates

Opportunities:

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

Threats:

- Lack of staff.
- Perceived retention/student success in online classes.
- Online courses/degrees/certificates from other schools.
- Book publishers designing courses that require the use of an outside system that we cannot access, support, train or review. We are rarely consulted prior to the integration of new technology and we have to spend a lot of time learning and integrating solutions.
- Unrealistic timeline expectations of faculty - last minute design projects.
- The quantity of classes created over the last couple of years vs. the quality of those classes.
- We do not have the staff, software/hardware, or time to create engaging learning objects that would enhance student experiences and success.
- Support demands make participating in providing service to the college challenging.
- Courses designed that do not follow the template that do not meet QM or Universal Design for Learning (UDL) standards.
- Faculty who underestimate the time and challenges of teaching online. Despite the required training, there are many who struggle with the technology and do not put forth the time needed to engage students online.
- Poorly prepared students. The orientation does a good job of highlighting the pluses and minuses of learning online and the amount of time that students need to spend online. Despite that, there are students who do not possess the technical skill or take the time that online learning requires.

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

Additional Information. On occasion, some programs may have additional documents that they feel should be included to complete the self-study. Supporting documents may include such things as program self-study reports, case study reports, survey statistics, focus group data, etc.

All supporting documentation must be dated within this CAR period. Please list below the additional documents that you will be adding to this CAR in support of your recommendations.