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Introduction and Background

Web-based learning was embraced by a few faculty members and academic departments at Cleveland State as long as 10 years ago. However, it has only been within the past few years that the efforts were more coordinated and supported with an eye to strategic University growth.

The Center for eLearning was officially created in the summer of 2006 under the leadership of Dean Barbara Hanniford of the Division of Continuing Education. Paul Bowers, Director of eLearning, joined Cleveland State two years ago. The Center’s major roles are to:

- Provide leadership for the University’s eLearning initiative
- Support and train faculty in designing and developing fully online, blended, and Web-enhanced courses
- Work with academic units on eLearning program development and marketing
- Lead in use of emerging eLearning technologies
- Ensure availability of information and student services for online students

Since its establishment, the Center has worked energetically to create a solid support infrastructure for eLearning and to expand the number of programs and courses offered in online or blended formats. As this report shows, these efforts have been very successful. Enrollments in eLearning courses have grown rapidly, a number of new programs have joined the group of programs already offered online, and support for both faculty and students is strong.

Board of Trustees Resolution

Given its interest in enrollment growth, Cleveland State’s Board of Trustees has been very interested in the role the Center for eLearning can play. In March, 2007, the Board adopted the following resolution:

March 16, 2007
RESOLUTION
IMPLEMENTATION AND REPORTING OF THE UNIVERSITY’S eLEARNING INITIATIVE

WHEREAS, Cleveland State University recognizes the importance of web based eLearning education as a part of the overall portfolio of education offerings available at the university; and

WHEREAS, the past University eLearning Committee’s review, findings and recommendation resulted in the forming of the Center for eLearning, reporting to the Provost through the Dean of Continuing Education, Dr. Barbara Hanniford; and
WHEREAS, the growth and quality of Cleveland State’s eLearning initiative is believed to significantly influence future campus enrollment;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Cleveland State Board of Trustees’ Academic Excellence, Competitiveness and Diversity Committee recommends that the President and Provost request the Center for eLearning to publish a formal eLearning Strategy with 1 to 5 year enrollment targets, a description of the programs and type of Web-based offerings planned, an organization plan that describes the faculty / administration relationship, a market analysis with Cleveland State’s competition and a financial model and timeline of major eLearning milestones; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the President and Provost are instructed to have the Center of eLearning report quarterly to Cleveland State’s Board of Trustees’ Academic Excellence, Competitiveness and Diversity Committee strategy updates, market analysis and progress toward goals.

The Center for eLearning provided regular updates to the full Board of Trustees or its Academic Affairs Committee in 2007-2008 and produced its first annual report in April, 2008. That report responded to the Trustee resolution by including a formal elearning strategy that included enrollment targets, program plans, and organization plan, a competitive analysis, a financial model, goals, milestones, and strategies. The current report represents an update of last year’s comprehensive document.

eLearning Strategy Steering Committee

An eLearning Strategy Steering Committee was created in May, 2007 to help guide the Center for eLearning in creating a vision, goals, projections, and plans. Committee members in 2008-2009 are:

Bette Bonder  Interim Dean, College of Science
Vijay Konangi  Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Faculty Relations
Tim Long  Director, Budget and Financial Analysis
Peter Meiksins  Professor, Sociology
Giannina Pianalto  Director, Graduate Admissions
Allyson Robichaud  Assistant Professor, Philosophy
Rob Spademan  Assistant Vice President, Marketing and Admissions
Glenda Thornton  Director, University Library
Marilyn Weitzel  Assistant Professor, Nursing
Bill Wilson  Chief Information Officer
Paul Bowers  Director, eLearning
Barbara Hanniford  Dean, Continuing Education (chair)

The Committee has been invaluable in providing input into a vision, plans, and strategies.
The eLearning Strategy Steering Committee adopted the following vision statement for elearning at Cleveland State University, which the Center for eLearning is using to guide its efforts:

CSU eLearning efforts will form a major strategy for achieving our goal of graduating well-educated students who will help drive economic, civic, and intellectual growth for the entire region and state. By 2012, CSU will offer over 20 strategically chosen degree and certificate programs online. CSU will have developed a streamline process for moving programs online quickly and responsively. CSU will be engaged in several partnerships regionally, nationally, and internationally to develop and deliver elearning programs. eLearning enrollments and programs will increase steadily each year, with a significant portion representing students who would not otherwise attend CSU except for online opportunities. Students in the region, the state, and beyond will choose CSU because of our reputation for high quality academic programs, outstanding support service, and convenient, flexible scheduling. Faculty will embrace elearning as an important way to reach new audiences and to enhance the overall quality of education at CSU.

Strategic Goals for eLearning

The eLearning Strategy Steering Committee helped to set the following strategic goals last year. These continue to be the goals guiding the Center for eLearning’s work.

GOAL 1: Ensure high quality elearning courses and programs at CSU.
GOAL 2: Develop new programs rapidly that respond to demonstrable needs in the educational marketplace.
GOAL 3: Offer elearning programs that will significantly enhance enrollments at CSU.
GOAL 4: Develop a sustainable organizational model for elearning that promotes both growth and quality and fosters internal and external collaboration.
GOAL 5: Develop a delivery and support system that provides consistent, satisfying, and seamless educational experiences for elearning students and faculty.
**Enrollment history**

Cleveland State has had great growth in elearning enrollments over the past six years, as shown in the Figure 1 below. From academic year 2006-2007 to this year, student credit hours in online and blended courses increased by 139%. Enrollments grew 55% from AY 2007-08 to AY 2008-09. See Appendix A for more detail on elearning course sections and enrollments, broken down by totally online vs. blended status and by graduate/undergraduate level.

**Figure 1. Headcount enrollments and student credit hours from 2003-04 to 2008-09**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>Head Count</th>
<th>SCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AY03-04</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>2808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY04-05</td>
<td>1224</td>
<td>3824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY05-06</td>
<td>2413</td>
<td>7666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY06-07</td>
<td>3962</td>
<td>12409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY07-08</td>
<td>6405</td>
<td>20648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY08-09</td>
<td>9050</td>
<td>29674</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Enrollments for AY 2008-09 are based on preliminary figures for the spring semester.

**Enrollment Targets**

In the previous annual report, enrollment targets were established at relatively modest levels. Experience among other institutions indicates that explosive growth is not uncommon in the early years of elearning program development. However, it is unrealistic to expect such explosive growth to continue as the elearning programs rise to meet the level of demand. National data suggest that elearning enrollments across institutions are still likely to grow at double-digit rates for the next several years because of unmet demand among adult populations.

This year we will exceed targets established last year. In fact, our total growth will meet the target level set for the 2009-10 academic year. Consequently we have revised growth projections upward, but still below historical levels due to the projected slower rate of growth as the base number increases. Overall growth targets have been set at 25% for AY 2009-10 (compared to 20% previously) and at 20% for AY 2010-11 and AY 2011-12, as shown in Figure 2.
More important, demographic data discussed later in this report clearly suggest that CSU can do better penetrating the overall Northeast Ohio region and state. Most of our elearning enrollments come from within Cuyahoga County. These data suggest that there is significant room to expand our geographic reach and attract new student to CSU via elearning programs. Certainly, elearning course offerings make CSU more competitive in the marketplace. But the strategic goal is to expand markets by serving new populations of students not otherwise seeking enrollment at CSU. We will focus on this strategic goal by increasing the number of complete programs available online to attract students who cannot attend traditional classes because of employment, family commitments, or distances.

Overall, the number of students enrolling in elearning courses and programs combined will continue to grow at a rate well above the enrollment increases overall across the university.
Competitive Analysis

Cleveland State University functions in a very competitive arena, especially in the elearning marketplace. Nationally, the Sloan Consortium noted in 2008 that online enrollments have grown substantially faster than overall higher education enrollments. The Sloan Consortium study, “Staying the Course: Online Education in the United States, 2008” also found:

- Over 3.9 million students were taking at least one online course during the fall 2007 term, a 12% increase over the number reported the previous year.

- The 12.9% growth rate for online enrollments far exceeds the 1.2% growth of the overall higher education student population.

- Over 20% of all U.S. higher education students were taking at least one online course in the fall of 2007.

In 2007-2008, CSU elearning enrollments have grew at a rate over 4 times the national average reported by the Sloan Consortium. Nearly 25% of CSU students took at least one elearning course between Summer 2007 and the end of Fall 2009.

In Ohio, the Ohio Learning Network found that almost 60,000 students were enrolled in at least one elearning course at a public institution in Fall 2007—a 20.1% increase from 2006. By comparison, CSU elearning enrollments increased 55% for the same period, jumping to 2165 headcounts for Fall 2007 from 1415 a year earlier. Enrollments also increased at a rate of 55% from Fall 2007 to Fall 2008.

The Ohio Learning Network’s most recent data (Figure 3) show that Cleveland State maintained its position with the fourth largest elearning enrollment (unduplicated headcount) among Ohio’s public universities in Fall 2007. However, the gap between CSU headcounts and those of the other three institutions ahead closed significantly in this period. The difference in headcount between CSU and University of Toledo was nearly 3000 in 2006, but that difference dropped to 2127 in 2007.
In terms of number of courses and programs offered relative to public and private competitors, Cleveland State has a high number of online course offerings and a growing number of degree and certificate programs (see Table 1). The University of Toledo remains the leader among Ohio public universities; however, the percentage of change in headcount for 2007 was -2.07. By contrast, CSU lead all universities with a total headcount increase of 755 students or 62.5%. Ohio University and Miami University also had sizeable percentage increases, although the actual headcount increases were significantly lower than CSU. Certainly, Cleveland State’s competitive position and reach has increased by adding more complete online or blended degree and certificate programs.
Table 1. Degrees and Courses Offered Online at Selected Institutions in Ohio.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Degrees</th>
<th>Courses 08-09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>Undergrad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland State</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Toledo</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Green</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Akron</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiffin University</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin University</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana Wesleyan Online</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Phoenix</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaplan University</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* does not include Summer 2008

Source: Institutional websites.

We have updated information on tuition of our competitors, as shown in Table 2 below. Cleveland State tuition is in the range of other state institutions. The University of Cincinnati appears to be the lowest of state universities in this comparison, which is significant because UC has a growing online program that has begun marketing quite heavily. On the other hand, the University of Toledo, the largest provider of elearning programs among state universities, has tuition at nearly the same level as CSU.

Tuition at public universities remained largely the same this year due to mandated tuition freezes, but the tuition at for-profit and private institutions rose slightly at about 1.5 -2%. Overall the number of degree and certificate programs also did not change very much. It appears a few programs have been dropped at some institutions, while the biggest overall rise in additional programs has been at the graduate and certificate levels.

Both Bowling Green and University of Toledo waive out-of-state tuition for students taking all credits online. Both institutions report that this has had positive impact on their out-of-state recruiting for elearning programs. Currently one CSU elearning program in the College of Education and Human Services offers scholarships that offset out-of-state tuition. The cost of the tuition reduction has been absorbed by the College, but this subsidy will end next year. Reduction of out-of-state tuition for elearning students at CSU is currently being reviewed.

Tuition at private and for-profit institutions tends to be lower than most public universities in this comparison. Private and for-profit institutions often market total program costs rather than a per-credit hour fee. Theses institutions also tend to have more variable fees from program to program. Typically Business programs charge the higher end of the scale and Criminal Justice and Education Programs fall at the lower end.
Table 2. Tuition Comparison at Competitive Institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Undergrad In-State</th>
<th>Undergrad Out-of-State</th>
<th>Grad In-State</th>
<th>Grad Out-of-State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland State</td>
<td>$330</td>
<td>$615</td>
<td>$439</td>
<td>$834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Green State</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$749*</td>
<td>$489</td>
<td>$838*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State</td>
<td>$384</td>
<td>$722</td>
<td>$408</td>
<td>$728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Toledo</td>
<td>$330</td>
<td>$696*</td>
<td>$436</td>
<td>$822*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Akron</td>
<td>$288</td>
<td>$578</td>
<td>$342</td>
<td>$611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
<td>$262</td>
<td>$665</td>
<td>$412</td>
<td>$747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiffin University</td>
<td>$400-475</td>
<td></td>
<td>$700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin University</td>
<td>$280-335</td>
<td></td>
<td>$450-530</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana Wesleyan Online</td>
<td>$271-423</td>
<td></td>
<td>$445-548</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Phoenix</td>
<td>$333-515</td>
<td></td>
<td>$515-625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaplan University</td>
<td>$336</td>
<td></td>
<td>$350-420</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Out-of-state tuition is waived for students taking ALL courses online.

Source: Institutional websites.

Demographic Analysis

The Center for eLearning has begun tracking demographic data on students taking elearning courses at CSU. We have included information here regarding the distribution of students geographically, the age of elearning students, the number of credits taken during a semester by students in elearning formats, and the degree status of students enrolled in elearning courses. This analysis is based on the group of students who took at least one elearning course between Summer 2007 and the end of Fall 2008 (N=2579).

Overwhelmingly, students taking elearning courses reside in Cuyahoga County (88% of the group). The next largest distributions were in Lake County (7.8%) and Lorain County (6.6%). Out-of-state students represented 3.6% of elearning enrollments.

The age of elearning students revealed some surprising trends. The largest overall group of elearning students fell into the 24-35 year old age bracket in both graduate and undergraduate categories. However, the largest single group falls into the undergraduate 23 and under age group. Figure 4 illustrates the breakdown by age for elearning students in the sample. A further study of age by classification (Senior, Junior, etc) and residential status is underway to further refine the picture of students in this age group. This age analysis reveals that elearning courses are appealing to a great number of traditional-aged undergraduate student, not only the adult learners one would expect to see enrolled.
We also looked at the number of degree-seeking and non-degree-seeking students enrolled in elearning courses. Overwhelmingly, students enrolled in elearning courses are seeking a degree. Ninety-one percent of students enrolled in elearning courses are looking to complete a degree or certificate program. Most of the non-degree seeking students are at the graduate level and may, in fact, be seeking a degree, but have not yet been formally admitted to a program. Figure 5 illustrates the number of degree seeking and non-degree seeking students.

Only a tiny number of students at the undergraduate level were considered non-degree seeking, which suggests that we do not attract many students from other colleges or universities to our elearning courses. Students at other institutions often seek courses on a non-degree status to transfer back to home institutions, especially during summer terms. Although it does not appear that we attract many such students, most elearning courses at the undergraduate level fill almost immediately once registration opens.
Based on an earlier analysis, we are seeing a clear trend of students mixing elearning courses with face-to-face courses as part of their load. A relatively small number are taking only elearning courses. The number of credits taken by students enrolling in elearning also varies. Table 3 shows the number of students and distribution of credit hours earned during the sample period from Summer 2007 through Fall 2008. During the period of this sample, most students took a total of between 4 and 6 credits in elearning courses. Only slightly fewer took just 1-3 credits via elearning. Relatively few students took 10 or more credits via elearning in this period. These data suggest that students are not enrolling in elearning as the only delivery method for courses and that they prefer to mix traditional and electronic forms of instruction.

These results will serve as an important benchmark to chart the impact of fully online or blended programs will have on this distribution.

Table 3. Students taking credit hours in elearning courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 3</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>1017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 6</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>1093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 to 9</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 to 15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 to 21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>1606</td>
<td>2579</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Analysis based upon the group of students taking at least one elearning course from Summer 2007 through Fall 2008.
Overall, the demographic data suggest that we should examine our goals for elearning with respect to geographic reach and the characteristics of learners we seek to serve. At present our program primarily serves students in Cuyahoga County who are under 35 years old, with a significant group of undergraduates 23 years old or under. These students seem to mix courses in both traditional and elearning formats. Further study of these populations might seek to determine whether blended modes of learning that combine fewer class sessions with an increased elearning component might serve their needs well. Additionally, we should address other factors that might inhibit students outside the immediate Cleveland area from enrolling in elearning programs as well as increasing marketing efforts to the broader metropolitan and regional areas.

Program Plans

Last year’s report listed several programs Cleveland State offered via elearning:

- **A Master of Science in Nursing in Specialized Populations.**
- **A Master of Education in Education Technology** (including an *Endorsement in Educational Technology*).
- **A Master of Science in Health Sciences**
- **Graduate and undergraduate certificates in Bioethics**
- **A Graduate Certificate in Research Administration** (offered by the Maxine Goodman College of Urban Affairs).

These programs were developed by the initiative of faculty and chairs in the respective departments, with very little support of the kind currently offered by the Center for eLearning. The Center is working with these programs to provide greater support, especially in terms of redesigning some coursework and extending marketing efforts.

Several additional elearning programs were launched in the 2008-09 academic year. These programs were selected based on a combination of market need, faculty interest and capacity, availability of some courses already online, and overall likelihood for success. The goals for these programs are to generate some new enrollment, provide models of success to encourage other programs and faculty, and establish a stronger presence in the elearning marketplace.

These new programs include:

- **B.S.N. in Nursing**
  - Completion program for students with an R.N. in Nursing
- **B.S. in Health Science**
  - Completion program for students with associate degrees
- **Gifted and Talented Learners Endorsement**
  - Master level endorsement with M.Ed. option
- **Early Childhood Mental Health Endorsement**
  - Required for at least one staff member in all Ohio daycare centers by 2010
• **MBA pre-requisite courses and electives**  
  o Graduate level courses required for entrance to the MBA program  
  o Additional MBA courses which began development in Summer 2008  

• **General Education course package**  
  o Complete undergraduate offering of courses supporting degree completion

The General Education and Pre-MBA packages are completely developed. Final courses in the curriculum for the other programs will be completed in the summer and fall 2009.

New programs plans for 2009-10 and beyond include an emphasis on programs with a strong potential market that will attract significant new enrollments to the university and extend CSU’s market reach to more regional, statewide, and national populations of students. Programs with potential to reach international audiences are also under discussion.

The Center for eLearning has received proposals and committed support for several new programs that will begin offering courses in AY 2009-10. Courses are beginning development this spring and summer, with completion scheduled for AY 2010-11. Based on planned course offerings, these programs, combined with the existing programs above, should account for approximately 6,500 semester credit hours of targeted enrollment for 2009-10.

These programs include:

• **Teacher Education Core Courses**  
  o Undergraduate core courses for secondary teacher licensure.

• **Adult Learning and Development Program**  
  o Master degree in Education designed for a wide range of professionals. (Does not require K-12 licensure.)

• **Gerontology Certificate**  
  o Graduate and Undergraduate certificates for Health Sciences

• **Theatre Minor**  
  o History, Literature, and Design course sequence.

• **Inspired Leaders Program**  
  o A Master’s-level education program for Principal Licensure in a blended format.

In addition, discussions are underway on a General Communication major focusing on general communications and public relations. This possibility is pending faculty approval.

**Finances**

eLearning at Cleveland State has been organized as a University support activity. The Center for eLearning employs a staff of 6, plus a Director, who provide instructional design, media development, technical support, and program coordination services to academic programs and faculty involved with elearning, as well as marketing support. The Center not only supports
elearning programs, but also supports the integration of elearning technology and practice with traditional instruction.

Table 4 illustrates the additional investment the university is making to support elearning efforts. This investment is beyond the normal costs of operation, instruction, and overhead. It represents the additional costs necessary to support strategic growth in elearning programs, including staff salaries and benefits for the Center for eLearning, elearning technological infrastructure, marketing, and costs of developing courses. It should also be noted that the Center for eLearning supports faculty and students not only for online and blended courses, but wherever elearning technology is used to support instruction. Hundreds of traditional, face-to-face courses make use of our elearning infrastructure and services. While enrollments have grown explosively, the financial investment in elearning has grown more modestly, with heavy reliance on one-time funds for operations and faculty development support.

Table 4. eLearning Project Investment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2008</th>
<th>FY 2009</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Permanent Budget</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for eLearning Staff</td>
<td>$480,000</td>
<td>$481,000</td>
<td>$505,050</td>
<td>$530,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Budget</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
<td>$17,322</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eLearning Infrastructure</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>One-Time Funding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td>$44,000</td>
<td>$57,500</td>
<td>$57,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Budget</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$84,000</td>
<td>$88,200</td>
<td>$92,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Technical Support</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Incentives – Course</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure upgrades</td>
<td></td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Courses per year</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Costs</strong></td>
<td>$852,027</td>
<td>$1,041,322</td>
<td>$1,075,750</td>
<td>$1,145,412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assumptions:
- Staff = 5% annual increase in salary/benefits.
- Infrastructure based on IS&T costs for Blackboard learning management system.
- Faculty Release based on $7,500 per course
- Marketing Budget based on 5% growth over 2008-09 levels.
- FY 2008 and FY 2009 costs are estimated actual; FY 2010 and FY 2011 are projected.

Table 5 illustrates the tuition revenue (instructional component only) received from students enrolled in elearning courses. These courses include fully online and blended courses (courses that include a significant online component, along with some face-to-face class meetings). Revenue from web-enhanced courses (traditional courses that add a web
component but do not reduce face-to-face class sessions) is not included in these figures. Many faculty now include a web component in traditional classes. Over 450 traditional courses during the spring 2009 semester used a web component.

The revenue for elearning courses is based only on the instructional fee, excluding any other fees. The projected revenue for future years is based on enrollment targets presented in Figure 3, above. Table 5 also shows revenue for program-only enrollments based on enrollment targets. Program-only enrollment refers to students enrolled in courses that form part of a complete elearning program. As new programs are launched, this will be one measure of looking at new students enrolling at CSU because of elearning programs.

### Table 5. eLearning Projected Tuition Revenue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2008</th>
<th>FY 2009</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total eLearning Headcount</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad SCH</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>20,300</td>
<td>25,375</td>
<td>23,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad SCH</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>8700</td>
<td>10,875</td>
<td>10,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total SCH</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>36,250</td>
<td>43,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tuition Revenue</td>
<td>$6,374,000</td>
<td>$9,242,300</td>
<td>$11,552,875</td>
<td>$13,863,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program -Only Revenue</td>
<td>$1,043,763</td>
<td>$1,944,900</td>
<td>$2,669,058</td>
<td>$3,202,935</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assumptions:**
- Revenue Assumption = $286/undergraduate SCH, $395/graduate SCH (instructional fee held constant for four years)
- Grad/Undergrad ratios based on historical data
- Includes online and blended courses – not web enhanced
- Program-Only revenue is that portion of Total Revenue attributable to students enrolled in complete elearning programs
Accomplishments

The elearning initiative at Cleveland State has had a number of accomplishments since the Center for eLearning was established almost two years ago. Among the major milestones in the past two years are these:

- eLearning enrollments increased almost 55% over AY 2007-08. Three-year growth is 139%.
- CSU is the fastest growing elearning program among public universities in Ohio according to data reported by the Ohio Learning Network.
- Several programs launched during AY 2008-09; several new elearning programs under development for AY 2009-10.
- The Center supported development of nearly 40 new elearning courses through a faculty incentive program and course design process.
- An online course evaluation system was added, allowing for electronic delivery and management of surveys and data.
- Faculty development “Boot Camp” successfully launched in January, with 39 faculty participating in the two-day training and development.
- Launch of a comprehensive faculty development and training curriculum, including online workshops and experiences.
- eLearning course management system upgraded to Blackboard CE 8 and a multi-server environment installed to handle increase system usage. Concurrent users during peak periods now exceed 500.
- eLearning brochure and marketing website developed, with website launching in April 2009.
- 8 CSU faculty and staff become certified “Quality Matters” elearning course reviewers. Quality Matters is a national set of standards and a review process for elearning course design. Voluntary review of selected courses begins this spring.
- Web Conferencing software pilot is underway to provide real-time, interactive communication for elearning courses.
- Student “elearning Consultants” were added to the staff and trained to extend technical and media development support and to respond the rising volume of help calls received by the Center.
- The Center for eLearning has joined the Eduventures Online Higher Education Learning Collaborative that includes 93 institutions providing elearning. The collaborative provides access to custom research, collaborative research, and benchmarking data. Research will be used to assess opportunities for new program development and best practices for elearning.
Future Milestones: Progress and New Milestones

For each strategic goal, last year the eLearning Strategy Steering Committee identified a number of milestones for the next five years along with a current progress indicator. Items in bold represent new milestones added by the eLearning Strategy Steering Committee this year.

GOAL 1:
Ensure high quality elearning courses and programs at CSU.

Milestones:
- Implement a formal course development process for online programs in 2007-2008. **Achieved**
- Offer an instructors’ “certification” program for faculty teaching online 2008-2009. **Nearly achieved**
- Most elearning courses show either no-significant difference or favorable differences with respect to student achievement when compared to face-to-face courses. By 2010. **Not yet achieved.**
- Most eLearning courses show either no significant difference or favorable differences with respect to retention when compared to face-to-face courses. By 2012. **Not yet achieved (Demonstrate improvements in retention for elearning courses year to year.)**
- Most CSU elearning courses will be developed using nationally recognized standards. By 2012. **In progress**
- Establish a program for systematic review of courses for all elearning programs, based on national standards. By Fall 2009.

GOAL 2:
Develop new programs rapidly that respond to demonstrable needs in the educational marketplace.

Milestones:
- Implement a program development and budget planning process for use with all new elearning programs in 2007-2008. **Nearly achieved**
- Reduce time-to-market for elearning programs approved for online delivery to less than 9 months. By Fall 2009. **Achieved**
- Offer all new elearning programs in delivery formats that best meet demonstrated needs of targeted audiences. By Fall 2009. **In progress**
- Establish a framework for systematic market research on new program viability and competitive analysis for all new programs. By Fall 2009.
- Develop and launch 3 new elearning programs with significant potential for new enrollments (100+ students) for launch by Fall 2010.
GOAL 3:
Offer elearning programs that will significantly enhance enrollments at CSU.

Milestones:

- Determine method for tracking and measuring new enrollments for elearning courses/programs beginning in 2008-09. **In progress**
- Show 20% rate of growth in elearning enrollments for 2008-09 and 2009-10 and at least 15% for the three years thereafter. **In progress and on track. Increase to at least 25% and 20% for subsequent years from AY 2008-09.**
- Offer at least 3 additional elearning programs in each academic year. Beginning with Fall 2008 through 2012. **In progress and on track**
- Offer at least one elearning program that reaches international audiences by 2010. **In progress**
- Enrollments in elearning programs contribute to a significant portion of overall elearning growth (versus student enrollment in individual courses). **In progress**
- Demonstrate the degree to which elearning programs attract new students to CSU. By AY 2009-2010
- Redevelop and update existing programs to better meet market needs and demands.
- Increase the distribution of elearning students from counties outside of Cuyahoga County from 12% to at least 25%. By 2011.

GOAL 4:
Develop a sustainable organizational model for elearning that promotes both growth and quality and fosters internal and external collaboration.

Milestones:

- Center for eLearning and University marketing executes a marketing plan to promote elearning integrated with the overall university plan. Spring 2008 and thereafter. **In progress and on track**
- Develop a program to support creation and/or distribution of elearning materials in content repositories, including both faculty incentives and technical infrastructure. **Not yet achieved**
- Center for eLearning and University Marketing launches an elearning web site that provides a single point to promote all elearning programs and to generate elearning program inquiries. Spring 2008. **Nearly achieved**
- Center for eLearning demonstrates collaborative program development model with CSU academic units through successful launch of at least 3 new elearning programs. Fall 2008. **In progress and on track**
- Demonstrate that eLearning programs achieve a break-even in new programs overall by 2009-2010 and show a positive return on investment each year thereafter. **In progress**
- Offer at least two elearning programs developed in partnership with other institutions. By Fall 2012. **Not yet achieved**
• Demonstrate successful collaboration with CSU Centers, admissions, appropriate academic programs, and other stakeholders in adult and returning students by developing at least 2 new programs or redeveloping at least 2 existing programs targeted at adult populations. By Fall 2009

GOAL 5:
Develop a delivery and support system that provides consistent, satisfying, and seamless educational experiences for elearning students and faculty.

Milestones:
• Center for elearning publishes Getting Started and Getting Help resources for all elearning students, provides ongoing training for all appropriate units on helping students get started (Campus 411, 5050 Call Center, Extended Campus staff, advisors, etc.) Fall 2007.  Achieved
• Center for eLearning establishes clear service metrics for elearning support services. 2007-2008.  Achieved and ongoing
• Center for eLearning creates a 3-5 year infrastructure development plan to keep up-to-date with new technology and improved elearning support services. Spring 2008.  In progress
• Satisfaction benchmarks established for elearning services through faculty and student surveys. Improvements to benchmark satisfaction increase each year. Spring 2008.  In progress
• Center for eLearning meets or exceeds all service metrics in 2008-2009.  In progress

Conclusions

eLearning growth at CSU remains explosive, and more students and faculty seem to embrace this mode of delivery. However, it also seems clear that we may be largely serving existing populations of students, rather than attracting new ones. The data we have gathered do suggest some strategies for the next year.

1. Actively promote and support blended learning as a way to serve students who prefer a mix of traditional and electronic instruction. Blended learning can be a powerful way to take advantage of the convenience and flexibility of elearning while maintaining the connections and personalization of traditional face-to-face instruction. It is easy to think of elearning as fully online and distinct from traditional, face-to-face instruction. Blended learning approaches can help weave elearning more intentionally and thoughtfully into our goals to serve residential students as well as adult learners.

2. Develop new elearning programs with intent to attract students not otherwise coming to CSU, especially in communities outside the immediate metro area. This means differentiating audiences by creating whole program delivery models and scheduling alternatives that meet the needs of specifically targeted populations. We already have
successful examples within the institution that can be used as guides.

3. For new elearning programs, place a priority on those programs with the potential to attract significant cohorts of students each year and be prepared to offer enough sections to service the demand. The Bachelor of Science in Health Sciences, Adult Learning and Development, Inspired Leaders, and RN to BSN programs fit this priority.

4. Seek more partnerships with area Community Colleges for completion and 2+2 programs that can be delivered in a blended or elearning format.

5. Focus on undergraduate program development targeted at adult populations. Many of our elearning offerings are graduate programs and certificates. There is a need for more undergraduate opportunities and the market potential in just Northeast Ohio is very large.

6. Market our strength as a regional institution with respect to elearning programs and emphasize our traditional roots. Differentiating ourselves in both marketing messages and strategy will be key to increasing enrollment reach via elearning.

Cleveland State continues to be well positioned for leadership in elearning through the instructional design, administrative support, and strategic planning efforts of the Center for eLearning; the increasing interest among academic departments; and the cooperation and support of other administrative units. We continue to experience tremendous growth in elearning enrollments, but we also have great opportunity to reach new segments of students. Our major efforts over the coming year will be to build upon our growth and success by creating new programs and redesigning current ones that meet this opportunity.