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Executive Summary
Educational Technology Services (ETS) was instrumental in furthering the mission of The University of Texas at Dallas during Academic Year 2015-2016. The department realized a 10% increase in blended/online course offerings over the previous year. 82% (5,670/6,883) of all sections offered actively used the eLearning Learning Management System (LMS). ETS renovated and updated the audiovisual systems in 46 rooms, completed major repairs in 65 rooms, and supported 135,022 class/lab sessions and 1,738 events. Classroom media uptime was 98.96%. The number of help calls to Media Services decreased 31% over the previous year, despite an 11% increase in the number of sections offered. The department has reached an unprecedented level of institutional knowledge and stability.

Mission Statement
The mission of Educational Technology Services (ETS), a division of the Office of the Provost, is to provide the University's faculty, staff and students with educational technology resources and pedagogical instruction to facilitate the best possible learning experience. The focus of the team is to effectively integrate technology into online, hybrid and classroom-based courses.

Personnel
Educational Technology Services Staff under the direction of Dr. Darren Crone, Assistant Provost

- Maria Cubie, Administrative Assistant II
- Qin Fang, Associate Director
- Katrina Adams, eLearning Manager (Operations)
- Roopa Chandrasekhar, Manager (Training & Support)
- Dennis Nguyen, Instructional Designer II
- Sylena Measles, Instructional Designer II
- Irma Madrigal, Instructional Designer I
- Alan Safai Instructional Designer I
- John-Paul McGowan, Instructional Technology Training Specialist
- Ryan Arnold, Media Services Supervisor
- Timothy Kennedy, Media Technology Specialist IV
- Joe Martinez, Media Technology Specialist III
- Brian Crockett, Media Technology Specialist III
- Alex Donaghy, Media Technology Specialist III
- Daniel Delgado, Media Technology Specialist III (Student Union)
- (Open), Media Technology Specialist III (Student Union)
- Adrian Chen, Media Technology Specialist II
- Kristopher Porter, Media Technology Specialist II
- Kassiopeia Jackson, Media Technology Specialist I
- James Trammell, Media Technology Specialist I
- Darrell Chambers, Video Services Supervisor
- Michael Snyder, Audio Visual Technician III
- Bart Sand, Assistant Media Coordinator
- Micheal Mitchell, Audiovisual Engineer
- Philip Johnston, Software Systems Specialist III
- 5 Teaching Assistants (eLearning)
- 5 Student Workers (Media Services)
eLearning Services

Courses/Organizations
Each face-to-face section has a corresponding eLearning section created. There were 6,883 academic eLearning sections created, an 11% increase over AY 2014/15. 82% of these eLearning sections were actively used (figure 1).

Online/blended sections made up 7.5% of all course offerings. Online/blended credit hours accounted for 8.1% of total credit hours (figure 2). The department developed and supported 515 sections, an increase of 10% over AY 2014-15 (figure 3). While blended offerings saw a substantial increase (from 58 to 118), fully online offerings saw a slight decrease (from 409 to 397) compared to AY 2014-15. The decline in online sections offered is due in part to the realignment of the MS Accounting core curriculum, and the implementation of restrictions on the number of online courses that can be taught by senior lecturers put in place by the JSOM Dean. Additionally, the increase of blended sections offered likely cannibalized online offerings to some extent. As of the writing of this report, fall 2016 online offerings are +12% and blended offerings are +82% over fall 2015. Steady growth is expected to continue with both delivery modalities. Historical data are shown in figure 4.

Courses Using eLearning

Figure 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses Using eLearning</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>5,670, 82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>1213, 18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># online/blended sections</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(percentage change over previous AY)</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># online sections</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(percentage change over previous AY)</td>
<td>299 (+11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># blended sections</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(percentage change over previous AY)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total # of ALL sections</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(percentage change over previous AY)</td>
<td>4,717 (+8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Online/blended sections as a percent of all sections</strong></td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Online sections as a percent of all sections</strong></td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Blended sections as a percent of all sections</strong></td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total # credit hours</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blended/online sections</td>
<td>34,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total # credit hours online</strong></td>
<td>33,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total # credit hours blended sections</strong></td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total ALL credit hours</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416,566</td>
<td>435,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Online/blended credit hours as a percent of total credit hours</strong></td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Online credit hours as a percent of total credit hours</strong></td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Blended credit hours as a percent of total credit hours</strong></td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total enrollment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>online/blended sections</td>
<td>11,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total enrollment online sections</strong></td>
<td>11,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total enrollment blended sections</strong></td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Course Development
The eLearning team developed 30 new online and blended sections in AY 2015-16.

- ACCT 6356.0W1
- ACN 5314.0H1/ HCS 5314.0H1
- ACN 6349.5H1 / HCS 6349.5H1
- ATEC 6300.0W1
- ATEC 6331.0W1
- ATEC 6391.0W1
- BIS 3190.0H1
- CGS 3342.5H1
- CGS 4315.5H1 /CS 4315.5H1
- CRIM 4336.0W1
- CRIM 6309.0W1
- ECS 3390.0H1
- ED 5V02.0W1
- HUSL 6381.0H1
- MIS 6334.0W1
- OPRE 6301.0W1 /SYSM 6303.0W1
- OPRE 6302 / SYSM 6334.0W1
- PPPE 6365.0W1
- SOC 2305.0W1
- SOC 3342.0W1
- UNIV 2020.051

The team redeveloped 8 online and blended sections.

- ACCT 6201.CH1
- ACCT 6335.0W1/SW1
- ACCT 6343.0W1
- IMS 6360.0W1
- IMS 6365.0W1
- MECO 6303.CW1
- MIS 6308.0W1
- MIS 6360.0W1

The eLearning LMS is increasingly being used by non-academic groups. There were 243 eLearning Organizations created/supported, a 24% increase over AY 2014/15. Large/significant organizations included:

- Writing Center Resources for Faculty and Students
- UTD eLearning Student Forum
- Registrar 101
- Information Security – Employees
- Information Security – Students
- JSOM Career Management Center – Student Resources
- PeopleSoft and Related Training
- BBS Information Center
- Internship Seminar
- Pre-Arrival Modules for International Students
Course Evaluations and GPA Comparisons (Online, Blended, & Face-to-Face)

In AY 2015-16, graduate students generally rated blended/online courses the same as face-to-face offerings. Undergraduates showed the widest variance, rating blended highest, followed by face to face, and then online (figure 5). The same held true for instructor rating (figure 6). GPA for online and blended courses was higher than in face to face courses (figure 7). Generalizations with these data (particularly blended courses) should be made with caution as we have a small sample size, and not all types of courses are equally represented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the course was excellent (Online UG)</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the course was excellent (Blended UG)</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the course was excellent (f2f UG)</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the course was excellent (Online Grad)</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the course was excellent (Blended Grad)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the course was excellent (f2f Grad)</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall, the instructor was excellent (Online UG)</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the instructor was excellent (Blended UG)</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the instructor was excellent (f2f UG)</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>4.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the instructor was excellent (Online Grad)</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the instructor was excellent (Blended Grad)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the instructor was excellent (f2f Grad)</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6
Training and Support
Training/outreach was a major focus in AY 2015-16. A training specialist was hired to broaden the scope of the department. A 24/7 on-call phone for faculty and the UTD testing center was also implemented. The eLearning Team shifted to a more proactive approach, actively reaching out to faculty before they have issues. There were 195 training sessions offered (Group and One-on-one), a 43% increase over AY 2014/15. 612 customers (non-unique) were trained, a 174% increase over AY 2014/15 (figure 8). Additionally, an Online Teaching Certification was developed.

Examples of the sessions include:
- Blackboard Collaborate: 19 sessions
- Qualtrics: 22 sessions
- Turning Point Polling: 37 sessions
- Getting Started with eLearning: 22 sessions
- Student Engagement Tools: 10 sessions
- Assignments and Rubrics: 13 sessions
- Online Tests in eLearning: 20 sessions
- Intro to Respondus: 12 sessions
- Open Labs: 19 sessions
Outreach initiatives included:
- New Student Orientations
- UT Dallas Trainer Alliance
- UTD Training Expo
- Lunch & Learn – Karen Baynham & Eric Carlson
- JSOM Undergraduate Faculty Lunch & Learn – “eLearning Rubrics”
- OIT Summit
- JSOM MBA Consortium
- Cometville Carnival
- Facebook - https://www.facebook.com/utdelearning
- Twitter - https://twitter.com/UTD_eLearning

Improved processes and increasingly stable technology resulted in a substantial reduction in eLearning Help Desk calls. The support team saw 57% less tickets, down from 5,293 to 2,284 (figure 8); despite an 11% increase in eLearning sections. The students subset saw an increase in tickets. In the past year, many staff departments started using eLearning Organizations to reach students. The increase in tickets for this subset was primarily due to student inquiries about enrollment into these organizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15 (+27%)</th>
<th>2015-16 (+43%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training Sessions Offered</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Session Customers (non-unique)</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>223 (+30%)</td>
<td>612 (+174%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Desk Tickets Closed (Total)</td>
<td>4,304</td>
<td>5,293 (+23%)</td>
<td>2,284 (-57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Desk Tickets Closed (Faculty)</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>538 (-12%)</td>
<td>396 (-26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Desk Tickets Closed (Students)</td>
<td>1,758</td>
<td>1,417 (-19%)</td>
<td>1,676 (+18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Desk Tickets Closed (Unspecified) - When customer emails the Help Desk or a web form is submitted</td>
<td>1,932</td>
<td>3,338 (+73%)</td>
<td>212 (-94%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8
A customer satisfaction survey was sent out to faculty, staff, and students. There were 193 faculty/staff and 455 student respondents. Responses fell in the “Good” to “Excellent” range for all items except faculty/staff rating the quality of support from the outsourced 24/7 Helpdesk, which fell in the “Average” to “Good” range.

**Customer Survey Response:**

| Survey item (Faculty/Staff): How would you rate the quality of the eLearning training session/s you attended? | 4.29/5.0 |
| Survey item (Faculty/Staff): How would you rate the quality of support you received from the eLearning 24/7 Helpdesk (when you call 866-588-3192)? | 3.91/5.0 |
| Survey item (Students): How would you rate the quality of support you received from the eLearning 24/7 Helpdesk (when you call 866-588-3192)? | 4.27/5.0 |
| Survey item (Faculty/Staff): How would you rate the quality of support you received from on-site UT Dallas eLearning Staff (Instructional Designers and Trainers)? | 4.39/5.0 |
| Survey item (Students): How would you rate the quality of support you received from on-site UT Dallas eLearning Staff (Instructional Designers and Trainers)? | 4.33/5.0 |
| Survey item (Faculty/Staff): How would you rate Media Services’ response time to help-calls in your class/es? | 4.38/5.0 |
| Survey item (Faculty/Staff): How would you rate Media Services’ ability to resolve issues with classroom technology during your class/es? | 4.40/5.0 |

**Technology:**
eLearning boasted a 99.86% uptime. 82% of all sections taught had an active eLearning section. This was down slightly from 85% in 2014-2015 (figure 9). In addition to eLearning, the following technologies were supported:
- Blackboard Collaborate
- Respondus
- Respondus LockDown Browser
- Camtasia/SnagIt
- Clickers (Turning Technologies)
- Turnitin/Peermark
- Qualtrics
- Echo360

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eLearning Uptime percentage (based on total outage time)</td>
<td>99.89%</td>
<td>99.71%</td>
<td>99.8%</td>
<td>99.82%</td>
<td>99.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively used eLearning sections (total &amp; percentage)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5,231/6,186 (84.56%)</td>
<td>5,670/6,883 (82.38%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 9*
Accomplishments:
Online programs recognized in national rankings:
- Ranked number 7 among worldwide accredited online and distance learning MBA programs, *QS Distance Online MBA Ranking* (2016)

Challenges:
- Supporting growing instructional design needs while not being fully staffed
- Accommodating short turn-around course development/delivery needs

Future Direction:
- Increase blended/online offerings by 10% in AY 2016-17
- Fill vacant Instructional Designer I position
- Extending Instructional design consultation and support to enable faculty to become more self-sufficient in developing and delivering online/blended/technology enhanced courses
- Explore/Experiment with different course development models and innovative approaches
- Implement Online Teaching Certification for instructors
- Implement LEO for training services
Media Services

Media Services provided support for 135,022 class/lab sessions, in 132 classrooms and 36 conference rooms. Uptime for classroom media was 98.96% (improving from 98.4% in AY 2014/15). There was a 31% decrease in help calls answered by Media Techs despite a 6% increase in class/lab sessions over AY 2014/15 (figure 10). This was due primarily to 2/3 of classrooms being renovated over the past two academic years. 114 out of 132 classrooms have been updated in the past 5 years (figure 11). This year, new equipment was installed in 46 classrooms/labs/conference rooms, and major repairs were completed in 65 rooms. Media Techs conducted 733 one-on-one training sessions, which helped reduce user error. Classroom uptime and faculty satisfaction continues to improve.

On-site media support for events is a major function of the department. The number of events supported increased 6% over AY 2014/15 (from 1,645 to 1,738). Media Services supported 686 academic events and 1,052 student events. Major Events included:

- Commencement
- Doctoral Hooding
- University Convocation
- Founders Day
- Alumni Gala
- Kusch Lecture
- Phi Kappa Phi Induction
- State of the University
- Homecoming
- McDermott Award Finalists' Weekend
- International Talent Show
- Diversity Awards
- Freshman Orientation
- OIT Summit

Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Class Meetings/Help Calls</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class Meetings Supported</td>
<td>127,076</td>
<td>135,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Calls</td>
<td>2,032</td>
<td>1,398</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help Calls</td>
<td>2,032</td>
<td>1,398 (-31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Meetings Supported</td>
<td>127,076</td>
<td>135,022 (+6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Uptime (Calls/Class Sessions)</td>
<td>98.4% (2,032/127,076)</td>
<td>98.96% (+.56%) (1,398/135,022)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events Supported</td>
<td>1,645 (+81%)</td>
<td>1,738 (+6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10
New and completely renovated classrooms/labs: 39

- AH2 1.204
- ATC 3.205
- BE 2.506
- CB1 1.102
- CB1 1.104
- CB1 1.106
- CB2 1.202
- CB2 1.204
- CB2 1.206
- CB3 1.302
- CB3 1.304
- CB3 1.306
- CB3 1.308
- CB3 1.310
- CB3 1.312
- CB3 1.314
- ECSN 2.120
- FN 2.202
- FN 2.204
- FO 2.206
- FO 3.222
- FO 3.616
- GR 3.606
- GR 4.204
- JO 3.532
- JO 3.536
- JO 3.906
- JO 3.908
- JO 4.112
- JO 4.502
- JO 4.504
- JO 4.708
- PHY 1.103
- PHY 1.202
- SLC 1.102
- SLC 1.202
- SLC 1.204
- SLC 2.303
- WSTC 1.6

Non-academic rooms: 7

- FO 2.206
- JO 4.122
- PHY 1.606
- ROC 2.301T
- SU 2.905 A
- SU 2.905 B
- WSTC 1.6
Rooms Repaired: 65

- AD3.202
- AH2.1.204
- ATEC 2.101
- ATEC 2.602
- ATEC 3.410
- BSB 11.102E
- CB 1.104
- CB2 1.202
- CB2 1.204 X2
- CB2 1.206
- CB3 1.302
- CB3 1.304 X3
- CB3 1.308
- CB3 1.312
- CN 1.112
- CRA 11.601
- Dining Hall
- ECSN 2.112 X2
- ECSN 2.120 X3
- EODIAH
- ECSN 2.216
- ECSN 2.910
- FN 2.202 X2
- FN 2.306
- FO 1.202 X2
- FO 2.208 X2
- FO 3.616
- GR 3.420
- GR 3.606
- Gym
- HH Lecture Hall
- JO 2.604 X3
- JO 3.532
- JO 3.536
- JO 3.908
- MC 2.404
- MC 2.410
- ML 2.1218
- RHW
- ROC 1.202
- RL 3.204 X2
- RL 3.744
- SLC 1.214
- SLC 2.206
- SLC 2.303
- SPN Lab
- SPN 1.109
- SPN 1.115
- SPN 1.121
- SRH
- SLC 1.214
- SLC 2.206
- SLC 2.303
- SPN Lab
- SPN 1.109
- SPN 1.115
- SPN 1.121
- SRH
- TI Auditorium

**Customer Survey Responses**
A customer satisfaction survey was sent out to faculty, staff, and students. There were 193 faculty/staff and 455 student respondents. Responses fell in the “Good” to “Excellent” range for all items.

| Survey item (Faculty/Staff): How would you rate the reliability of the technology in your classroom/s? | 4.06/5.0 |
| Survey item (Students): How would you rate the reliability of the technology in your classrooms? | 4.06/5.0 |
| Survey item (Faculty/Staff): How would you rate the quality of training you received on classroom technology from a Media Services Tech? | 4.26/5.0 |
| Survey item (Faculty/Staff): How would you rate the audiovisual quality for event/s you have hosted? | 4.26/5.0 |
| Survey item (Students): How would you rate the audiovisual quality for events you have attended? | 4.15/5.0 |

**Accomplishments**
- Media Technicians have increased their collective skillset, ranging from basic to expert installation/repair capabilities
- Refined invoicing process
- Improved event request process

**Challenges**
- Late release of funds resulted in delayed classroom media installations
Future Direction

- Renovation of 30 more classrooms (this will complete the 3 year AV classroom upgrade project)
- Institute 5-year AV refresh cycle for all supported rooms
- Institute training procedure for junior employees to learn office processes under the supervision of upper-level specialists
- Institute a more efficient record-keeping system to track new install/repair requests, help calls, and response times
- Introduce student workers into classroom support
- Implement RoomView classroom technology monitoring system in all new classroom installations
- Redevelop webpage
- Improve business process for inventory
- Onsite technical training for staff

Video Services Productions

Video Services recorded/distributed 123 videos, a 2% decrease from AY 2014/15. 26 sessions were streamed (a 44% increase from AY 2014/15). There were 3,073 remote views by customers in China, India, Korea, etc. The Echo 360 lecture capture system is now installed in 10 rooms. There were 848 recordings (a 14% increase over AY 2014) and 36,772 student views (an 11% increase over AY 2014/15).

High profile event recordings included:
- Commencement Ceremonies
- Hooding Ceremonies
- Alumni Awards Gala
- University Lecture Series
- Center for Brain Health Lecture Series

Customer Survey Response

A customer satisfaction survey was sent out to faculty and staff. There were 193 respondents. The response fell in the “Good” to “Excellent” range.

| Survey item (Faculty/Staff): How satisfied were you with the video/s Video Services produced for you? | 4.38/5.0 |
Accomplishments
- Streamlined website to simplify requests process
- Delivered projects to customers via Box (eliminating the need for physical media)
- Successful test of using YouTube to live stream events enabling us to use the free service for live streaming and archiving
- Purchase of new video switcher (allowing independence from ATEC)
- Purchase of new cameras which can record in 4K, resulting in better image quality for final product

Challenges
- Transitioning to Blu-Ray from DVD

Future Direction
- Expand services as the University’s needs evolve
- Archive all existing historical videos to Box

Expenditures
- Media Services/Video Services (Operating) expenditures: $176,322.88
- Media Services (Commercial Paper for AV Upgrade project) expenditures: $1,162,852.93
- eLearning Services (Operating) expenditures: $42,312.61
- Salaries: $1,045,599
- Total expenditures: $2,427,087.42