To: Curriculum Council
From: Ad Hoc Subcommittee (Braddock, Cluskey, and Lee) to Formulate Recommendations on Porting Existing on-campus Courses to Extended Campus versions and related matters.
Date: June 5, 2007

The Ad Hoc Subcommittee submits the following for discussion and possible approval by the curriculum council. At this point, approval should be conditional on input and discussion with members of the DEC. The goal is to have recommendation ready to forward to the EC during Fall Term 2007.

Draft recommendations are on separate pages.
**Recommendation 1:**
OSU should adjust its tuition structure so that the cost per credit hour for resident (on-campus) students is the same for all courses offered by the university. (All refers to tradition on-campus courses and Extended Campus courses)

**Discussion:**
- The role of Extended Campus has evolved from its original mission of serving place-bound, nonresident students to serving those students and a significant and increasing number of resident students. We expect this trend to continue because it is a natural consequence of funding models currently in use, student learning styles, and student scheduling preferences. Tuition paid by resident students should be the same for all modes of delivery of a course.
- The recommendation distinguishes between tuition and fees. It is appropriate for students to bear the increased cost of legitimate fees such as lab fees and the current $80/student credit hour fee Extended Campus charges to cover the extra costs of maintaining infrastructure and staff related to delivering web-based instruction.
- The recommendation applies to students whose registration places them in the tuition plateau.
  - Charges for e-campus (web) courses to students who are primarily campus-based may not be equitable. Students within the plateau for tuition (12-16 hours) pay additional tuition charges ($120/hr. “tuition” + $80/hr. fees) for their e-campus courses, regardless of the plateau benefit.
  - There should there be a mechanism whereby campus-based students enrolled in courses within the tuition plateau would be charged only for the fees associated with the web-based course ($80/hour). That mechanism should also provide a means whereby the amount a faculty member currently “earns” when offering an e-campus course ($60/SCH) is sent to departments from the tuition paid within the plateau. This would enable reimbursement for additional faculty time devoted to offering e-campus (web) courses with the funds generated from the tuition that the student is already paying to the university.
  - A plan of this type would result in an equitable application of the tuition plateau benefit.
Recommendation 2:
When an existing on-campus course is ported to an Extend Campus course and delivery mode, an Category II Addendum process should be adopted that replaces the current approval process.

Discussion:
• A proposed form for the Category II Addendum approval process for porting of an existing course is attached at the end of this document.
• Under current procedures, an existing on-campus course that has received Category II approval can be ported to an Extended Campus version with review and approval by a department chair and the faculty member developing the ported course. We believe that input and review by the department curriculum committee or, if one does not exist, by the college curriculum committee should be an essential part of the porting process.
• Delivery of a course via e-campus (web) mode typically involves significant changes and broader departmental involvement will better assure that a ported course meets the established syllabus and the stated learning outcomes of the on-campus course.
• The proposed Category II Addendum approval process requires that liaison, when appropriate, be part of the approval process. The current procedure does not require liaison with effected units.
• A change in delivery mode can be significant. Liaison should occur when a course utilized across campus is ported to Extended Campus. Courses utilized across campus may serve unique needs for distinct options/majors. The degree to which course outcomes can be met may inevitably change with changes in delivery mode. In such cases, review of ported courses by faculty members outside of the offering department is needed to determine if the ported course still adequately serves user-department students. For example, replacing a wet lab with a virtual lab may be acceptable to the proposing department but may not serve the needs of a user department.
• Since a stream of direct revenue is associated with delivering courses via e-campus mode, instructors and departments have a financial incentive to offer them. Consequently, we expect that porting of courses will become increasingly popular, which makes careful quality control of ported courses all the more important.
**Recommendation 3:**
Develop and maintain a database of campus courses ported to extended campus courses on the Academic Programs website. The site should include a sample syllabus for each course.

**Discussion:**

- Course proposers do not always know all effected users. Users who might have been missed in the liaison process could still be made aware of ported courses.
- Such a database would be useful for departments developing new programs.
Template for Letter or E-mail of Approval of Course Conversion from traditional to online delivery, with explanation of purpose and procedure.

DATE:

TO: (Head/Chair/Director of originating department(s), Academic Programs, Extended Campus.)

FROM: [Proposing Academic Department] Curriculum Committee

SUBJECT: Approval for conversion of existing traditional course for online delivery.

The enclosed/attached course syllabus describes the course intended for migration from traditional campus-based instruction to online delivery.

In accordance with the criteria in the Curricular Procedures Handbook, OSU Policy on Electronic Delivery of Instruction [http://oregonstate.edu/ap/curriculum/policies/E_ecampus.html](http://oregonstate.edu/ap/curriculum/policies/E_ecampus.html), this memo serves as notification of the [proposing academic department]'s approval/non-approval of the proposed online version of the campus based course.

XXXX XXXXX
Curriculum Committee Chair
[Academic] Department

**Purpose of Departmental Curriculum Committee review of courses migrating from traditional campus-based to online delivery modalities and Criteria:**

Review and approval of the proposed online version of a campus based course by the originating academic department's Curriculum Committee is mandatory. The purposes of the review and approval process are:

1) **Purpose of review:**
   a) To broaden departmental participation by reviewing and comparing the proposed online course with the existing on-campus version.
   b) To affirm that the learning outcomes, originally approved by the Curriculum Council, of the existing on-campus course can be reasonably met in the new delivery mode.
   c) To affirm, when applicable, that appropriate liaison with affected academic departments has been conducted or to explicitly explain why liaison was not necessary.

2) **Process:**
   a) **Proposal:**
      i) Course proposer submits notification of the intent to develop a traditional classroom-based course for online delivery to the originating academic department's Chair/Head and department or college curriculum committee and requests review. The notification should include:
         (1) The campus-based course syllabus and the proposed online course syllabus.
         (2) Learning outcomes for the approved on-campus course and learning outcomes for the ported course.
(3) Proof of liaison with affected academic departments, when appropriate, or explanation that liaison was not needed.

(4) The letter or email notification with attachments copied to:
   (a) Originating Academic Department’s or College Curriculum Committee
   (b) Academic Programs Office and
   (c) Extended Campus.

b) Review and decision:
   i) The originating department’s department or college curriculum committee will review the online course proposal and provide notification of decision to approve/not approve the online course within 4 weeks from date of review request.
   ii) In the case of submissions between terms or during the summer, 4 weeks will mean the first 4 week period of the normal academic year that follows submission of the proposal.

c) Record Keeping
   i) Submit your memo of decision (template provided above) to the Academic Programs Office, which will maintain documentation of approval decisions.
   ii) Copy academic department liaisons (if any) and Extended Campus on the memo of decision.