

E-Learning Rubric Sub - Committee Meeting Minutes

Date 1/27/2015 | Location Burrell 209

In Attendance: Bethany Emory, Mitch Fischer, Erin McCully, Danell Moses, Carolyn Porter, Barb Putman, Amy Russ, Cyndi Slocumb

Review of CRR Review Process 2015SP:

Discussed results from 2015SP both in terms of completion numbers and instructor feedback. Recap docs included at the end of the minutes)

- Barb suggested keeping the goal of 95% **Decision** – verbal consensus (perhaps) from the group but no vote – we can do at next meeting based on the review of the minutes
- Discussed the course schedule
 - o **Decision** - Committee decided that instructors must include a schedule, but allow for flexibility in the definition (Schedules don't have to outline every single item but can be a general guide of what will be covered and what students can expect, for folks who prefer not to reveal content – hidden folders continue to be an option)
- Discussed Syllabus Inconsistencies
 - o **Decision** – E-Learning will approach ISSA / Professional Development group to update Faculty Handbook to allow for:
 - Inclusion of syllabus information in a Bb/online site
 - Re-crafting the attendance statement in the faculty handbook to include online courses
 - In addition, once policy is reworked, e-learning to provide examples of statements in the CRR Training Resources course
- Discussed learning objectives in capstone and exam review courses
 - o **Decision** - Committee suggests that these must be put in
 - E-Learning will work with instructors
 - Hybrid classification of courses is also an option
- Discussed learning objectives in 3rd party tools
 - o Cyndi asked how other schools are doing this
 - Discussion of different review standards at different schools – will survey the DL Admins to see what we can discover
 - o Cyndi asked how SACS will be approaching that
 - o Cut and paste was given as an option – Barb and others had concerns about versioning and keeping two sites up to date
 - o Discussion of Program Coordinator / chair level approval – reliability came into question (busy folks with many other things to juggle – we may need a second set of eyes)
 - o Do we want to ask instructors to provide screenshots?
 - Instructor would have to show us screenshots or come by to show me their objectives in the 3rd party tool
 - Is this the best way to spend instructor's time?
 - o **Decision** – Deferred - It was suggested to convene a expert panel including program chairs from across campus who rely on these types of tools - Bethany to organize
- Discussed Technology tools
 - o Committee suggests that tech tools should be exemplary but not in the basic review
 - o **Decision** - Clarify the requirement to include exams as an interactive tool (to stay in line with what we require for face-to-face courses)
- Discussed the challenge for adjuncts
 - o Discussed possibilities for giving shells - what about "starter templates" that we would hold on the server
 - E-learning will need to develop a better list from deans of the templates that they have
 - Work to insure that the system works for Program Coordinators (and they know what will be given to whom and when)
 - Discussed that similar requirements are in place for face to face instruction.
 - Discussed how the requirements are being conveyed to the adjuncts – is it suggested that they are paid hourly or for the course including some preparation time
 - **Decision** – All adjuncts will complete the CRR

- Committee consensus that there will be times that flexibility is required as far as the deadline with adjuncts, and that flexibility will contribute to the 5% of non-completers (which is reasonable and acceptable)

Open Discussion – Exemplary Course Program

- Initial query of members (vote-ish)
 - Bethany and Erin and Mitch = QM
 - Barb & Cyndi & Danell = Bb
 - Abstentions (or not a clear vote recorded – Carolyn, Amy)
- Danell mentioned that she remains committed to the Bb Exemplary – mentioned her concerns that it is more rigorous and effective than it is in the training.
- We will need to make adjustments to the rubric (whichever is chosen) to make it 3 levels
 - Suggested - Ready, Commendable or Accomplished, Exemplary
 - It appears both rubrics could accommodate this
 - A certain number of points (not all required for exemplary) from QM could be "middle of the road"
 - Bb is currently a three tiered system
- Bethany discussed challenges in implementing the Bb rubric
 - Not sure what the overall score means – we would need to define that – what is required to be exemplary?
 - Some components / standards are confusing based on multiple types of information include – could be a beginner, intermediate and advanced based on what is included
 - Desire to eliminate the ability for the rubric to seem influenced (ie that some developers would be favored)
- Barb brings up that Bb is more achievable for how the contracting works (Course Development Contract)
 - Bethany mentions that at a recent policy revision – the standard was changed from meeting exemplary status to meeting expectations outlined by the E-Learning Committee
 - Cyndi suggested QM Level 2 could be the new standard
- Danell said that she teaches a lot of courses, training would be rigorous, maybe too much to expect faculty to do. The QM rubric is intimidating for instructors.
 - Agreement expressed by Carolyn
 - Discussion of reformatting into 3 tier process many make this manageable
 - Overall consensus that no matter which we use this will need to be a major focus
- Second query of members (vote-ish)
 - Although constructive dissent continued, the decision was made to move forward with the QM Rubric and develop a training and certification standard to be reviewed by faculty
 - Begin by running a few more courses through the rubric to see how close exemplary courses are currently
 - Break apart the QM rubric into three levels
 - Develop a few potential training / development paths to consider for 2015FA-2016SP development
 - Amy suggested using her course, Carolyn's already in process, Cyndi open to one of hers – not CIS-110

Next Steps:

- E-Learning to:
 - Approach ISSA about changes to wording in the faculty handbook to make CRR requirements consistent
 - Discuss with affected instructors the need to include course and module level objectives in Capstone and Exam Review courses
 - Convene a panel of 3rd party tool users, and bring a suggested review standard to next meeting (Schedules willing)
 - Review a number of courses using the QM rubric
 - Begin initial planning of a development training process to bring for discussion at the next meeting