

# *E-Learning Committee – Rubric Subcommittee*

## *Meeting Minutes*

### *October 7, 2014*

*Present: Melissa Allison-Brooks, Bethany Emory, Mitch Fischer, Erin McCully, Danell Moses, Barb Putman, Cyndi Slocumb*

## I. Agenda

1. Where are we Now? : Overview of the CRC (Course Readiness Checklist) Implementation so far
2. Ideas / Changes suggested /required before the Spring Term

## II. Report – Where are we now

- Erin McCully began the meeting with a presentation of data from the evaluation of the rubric process.

## III. Discussion (Big Points)

- Discussion of flow and process of course reviews (This was relatively confusing so I will not summarize here but...)
  - It became apparent that closing the loop for continuous improvement in our current setup was challenging
  - Decision was made not to review older courses
  - Consensus was to involve faculty in some way – so that they could let Erin know that their course was ready to review, and which course should be reviewed
- Discussion of the most challenging parts of the checklist
  - General consensus was that the all or nothing format of the checklist was challenging to implement
  - Discussion of developing a rubric followed, with Quality Matters also being suggested as an out of the box solution
  - Discussion over specific components of the checklist followed:
    - **The course and module learning objectives describe measurable outcomes.**
      - Is this a Readiness item or more of an upper level item
      - Will become more and more important as we approach the SACSCOC re-accreditation
      - Concern was expressed that faculty who are new to teaching may need further training

- It was mentioned that this remains tricky for faculty who have been trained in education
  - Suggestion was given that having a resource to view good examples could be helpful
  - Discussion of whether a course that had learning objectives present would meet the requirement – how we defined measurable etc
  - **Course provides a link to faculty contact information including office location (if on campus), SCC email address, telephone number, and office hours (whether physical or virtual).**
    - Discussion around one individual interpretation of the checklist came up - Instructor contact information was interpreted as being required in the Button/ Link area provided in Bb.
    - Some discussion of original intent suggested this may have been meant less literally
  - **Instructor states response time for communication and grading.**
    - Generally folks were missing this check based upon a grading response time
    - Several members of the committee suggested this was a challenge for faculty
    - Had to commit to the timeframe
- Discussion of communication challenges
  - Although Thom had e-mailed the checklist to faculty, feeling in the room is that many remained unaware of its intent, and their responsibilities surrounding it
  - Discussion of the intent began – do courses need to meet expectations prior to the start of the term, during the length of the term, at all?
  - Suggested that the checklist was about training and development but also about Continuous Improvement
  - The idea that training may not be the only answer – perhaps a sample course that meets expectations would help faculty to better process the requirements
  - A Web data base was discussed
    - This would provide some anonymity and direct access to information
    - Seems like a good solution for faculty but may take more time to be developed than we currently have, and may be a challenge to keep all the moving parts working at once
    - May not work as well for Arts and Sciences and Health Sciences as the name of the course would indicate the instructor
    - A discussion of a simple submittal form was had, consensus was that this may be a quick and easy start into the process

- Reporting was discussed including Google forms and Databases – this discussion was tabled as far as direct solutions – but the problem will need to be addressed

#### IV. Action Items

- After discussion, the committee narrowed the list down to several recommendations
  - ***The current rubric will roll forward into the Spring term – with a couple of minor modifications***
    - The standard surrounding Instructor contact information will be reinterpreted to allow placement of this information within the course at the instructors discretion – however any training materials will suggest the Instructor Contact Information link / button as the preferred location
    - We will continue to collect data on the communication and grading item – Examples to be provided, and Deans will choose how to pursue with their faculty. This may need to be looked at again in the Spring
    - The requirement for an image of the textbook in the syllabus will be removed
    - The course module learning objectives item will be modified to track both if they exist and if they are measurable to collect better data for further training. Erin will provide feedback directly to instructors on whether or not they are included, but will not suggest improvements for outcomes.
  - ***The elearning group will work with the Deans to develop a plan to involve faculty further within the process. This could be at divisional meetings, or training sessions***
  - ***The elearning group will work with the Deans to develop a plan to solidify the timing of the process and any continuous improvement expected as a result.***
  - ***Following these meetings the elearning group will evaluate required information to move the process forward and develop a communication plan (whether that be on the web, via email etc)***

#### V. Prep for Next Meeting

- Members of the committee will plan to attend the Online Quality Matters training the last two weeks of Oct.
- Next meeting will be dedicated to reviewing that process and deciding if implementing their rubric in some form will work or if we need to further develop the tools already in place. (Or some mixture of the two.)